26938

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* LeRoy Douglas Travis

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* Political Economy, Social Learning and Activism: Toward a Theory of Educational Turmoil

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* University of Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* Ph. D.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1975

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr. Charles C. Anderson

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* June 5, 1975 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ*

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE*
Dept. of Educational Psychology
Faculty of Education
University of BRITISH COLUMBIA, Vancouver, B.C.

NL-91 (3-74)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

POLITICAL ECONOMY, SOCIAL LEARNING AND ACTIVISM: TOWARD A THEORY OF EDUCATIONAL TURMOIL

by

©

LeRoy Douglas Travis

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommended to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled Political Economy, Social Learning and Activism: Toward a Theory of Educational Turmoil submitted by LeRoy Douglas Travis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy.

Charles C. Anderson
....
Supervisor

....

....

T. Pocklington
....

A. Côté
....
External Examiner

Date....June 2, 1975....

ABSTRACT

Activism and educational turmoil are studied within the context of the political economy of neocapitalism. The distribution of power within the liberal economy is examined in relation to the variability of material conditions and social relations which produce variability in people's perceptions, ideas, and behavior. The recorded descriptions of activists' behavior are analysed, as is documentary evidence pertaining to activists' perception, knowledge, ideas, complaints, strategies and objectives. The activists' disruption, paralysis and transformation of educational institutions is investigated through the analysis of activists' documents, the student and commercial press, scholarly studies of activism, "underground" newspapers, public documents, letters, interviews, surveys, private dossiers, and published studies on adolescent behavior, as well as the literature of social criticism, politics, economics, education, art, psychology, sociology, history and popular journalism. Emphasis is given to detailed examinations of activism in four Canadian centres, the ideas of activists, and the popularization, transformation, decline and effects of activism. The rudiments of a theory of activism which are derived from this material suggest that the appearance, popularization and decline of activism are related to (1) the uneven distribution of power and dependency between and within homes, and between and within nations; (2) differences in people's social learning patterns and habits of adaptation which variability of condition and the ecology of models produce; (3) the history, dissemination, transformation and assimilation of social criticism and other ideas which are conditioned by the relations of production; (4) the appearance and

character of social movements which are conditioned by the business cycle; (5) the marketing apparatus of mass commercial culture which exploits, transforms and popularizes novel phenomena; (6) cultural accomodation which is produced by those who anticipate pecuniary advantage or other reinforcers to accrue to themselves as a consequence; and (7) contingencies of reinforcement and punishments which can directly or vicariously disinhibit and inhibit behavior.

The history of industry, and industry as it objectively exists, is an open book on the human faculties, and a human psychology which can be directly apprehended... Every day, material industry [...] shows us, in the form of sensible, external and useful objects, in an alienated form, the essential human faculties transformed into objects. No psychology for which this book i.e. the most tangible and accessible part of history, remains closed, can become a genuine science with a real content. What is to be thought of a science which remains aloof from this enormous field of human work, of a science which does not recognize its own inadequacy, so long as such a great wealth of human activity means nothing to it, except perhaps what can be expressed in one word -- 'need' or 'common need'?

(Karl Marx, 1844)*

The great merit of Marx is that he made a distinction, in social phenomena, between an effective basis and a superstructure which oscillates between symbolism and an adequate consciousness, in the same sense (and Marx himself explicitly says this) as psychology is obliged to make a distinction between actual behavior and consciousness... The social superstructure stands in the same relation to its basis as does the individual consciousness to behavior.

(Jean Piaget, 1950)**

Revolutionaries are almost wholly the conventional products of the systems they overthrow. They speak the language, use the logic... observe...the...principles, and employ the...skills and knowledge which society has given them.

(B.F. Skinner, 1971)

T.B. Bottomore and M. Rubel (eds.), Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy, Middlesex: Penguin, 1963, *p.87, **p.63.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE PROBLEM AND A PERSPECTIVE 1

II. A REVIEW OF LITERATURE 9

Introduction to the Subject Under Investigation 9

Theories of Activism and Related Research 10

Criticism and the Problem of Assuming a Perspective 17

III. HISTORY, POLITICAL ECONOMY AND CONSCIOUSNESS 22

Dependency, Power and Cultural Transmission: The Roots of Cultural Continuity and Consciousness 22

Parental Power and Childhood Dependency: Establishing Control 22

Owner Power and Worker Dependence: Maintaining Control 23

Political and Economic Dimensions of Consciousness: Structure, Superstructure, Rulers and Rules 24

Relations of Production and Criticism: Division of Labour as a Source of Criticism 26

The Dialectic in History: The Past and Foreign in the Here and Now as Sources of Criticism 28

The "New" Criticism: The New Left in Social-Historical Perspective 30

The Disorder of Liberalism and Liberal Consciousness 35

The Early American New Left as a Liberal Left: Elicitation of a Traditional Expression 40

Eliciting Stimuli 44

Discovery of Praxis 46

IV. POLITICAL IDEAS AND ACTIVISM 51

Socialist Analysis and Extraparliamentary Action 51

Analysis of Reaction to the Distribution and Use of Power 54

Radical Students and Power at Columbia University 59

The Left at McGill University 60

The English-Speaking Student Left Outside of Quebec 83

The Student Left at the University of Saskatchewan (Regina Campus) 90

The Left and Activism at Simon Fraser University 99

Turmoil at the University of Alberta 134

Political Ideas and Activism 150

Ideas, Arousal and Behavior 160

V. MASS CULTURE AND TURMOIL 165

The Cultural Context: Mass Culture and Values 165

Criticism in Mass Culture: The 'Value' of Criticism and the Costs 166

Values and Fashion and the Weakening of the Moral Force of Intellect 166

The Marketing of 'Revolution' 168

The Profitability of Change-Making 170

Propaganda and Managing Change 172

Mass Media, the Illusion Industry: The Making of Popular Opinion and Values 173

Mass Media and the Cult of Youth: Selling Synthetic Apparitions and Revolution 176

The Selling of Trivial Difference: Marketing "Counter Culture" 178

Youth as a Stereotype in Mass Media 181

The Image of Youth as Visionary-Victim 182

Youth, the Schools and Extravagant Expectations 186

The Costs of Substituting Schooling for Politics 189

'Pop Ed Crit' 193

To School or Not to School 195

Money, Mass Media and the Shape of Unreality: The Common Sense of John Holt 197

Objections to Holt: The Development of Intellect and Interests as a Premise for Teaching 202

Turmoil and the Mass: The Ecology of Models and Social Learning in the Neo-capitalist Economy 207

The Decline of Turmoil 220

VI. THE LEARNING OF POLITICAL AND OTHER SOCIAL BEHAVIOR IN THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF MASS CULTURE: ANALYSIS & SUMMARY.. 228

Some Difficulties In the Realm of Theory and a Possible Path to Their Resolution 228

Some Social Learning Principles and Research 233

Activism and Turmoil: Summary and Analysis 245

Some Propositions: Toward a Theory of Activism 265

Epilogue 271

BIBLIOGRAPHY 273

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND A PERSPECTIVE

Young people, like all humans, have probably always faced (and I suspect will always face) conditions, arrangements, and events which have been, are, and will be perceived as unpleasant. However, they have not always reacted (nor do all of them now react) to those conditions with vigour even though, as Horn and Knott (1971, p. 978) remind us, student activism has been manifested frequently "from the dawn of the Western University". Furthermore, as I will document in subsequent chapters, a given person's behavior viz a viz a noxious condition may, can, and not infrequently does change. Thus, faced with a given condition the same person may demonstrate, protest, riot or in other ways actively resist the condition more consistently or continuously, while still another withdraw from the impact of the condition. And finally, a condition or event which is noxious for some persons may be perceived as agreeable or benign by others who accordingly, neither attack the condition or withdraw from it. As we shall see (in Chapter II), attempts to explain these phenomena are not altogether satisfactory.

How can we account for the ebb and flow of activism over time? More particularly, how can we explain the rise and fall of activism over the past fifteen years? Furthermore, what factors are involved in the dynamics of the individual's behavior? In other words, why do some people persist in their activism, while others act only sporadically, while still others initially withdraw and then act, even as still others who also withdraw, remain withdrawn?

The first two questions clearly demand a historical treatment. However, psychology also deals with the appearance and disappearance of behavior. Furthermore, questions of the latter type are subject to a broad range of analyses not only within the psychological realm but also in sociology or cultural anthropology and politics. Quite clearly, the subject at hand is a complex matter demanding a broad perspective.

In accordance with this imperative, the present approach is an attempt to understand educational turmoil in terms of a set of propositions which relate turmoil to social learning, mass culture and political economy. Economics, politics, culture and learning when taken together, provide a breadth of perspective that has been lacking in previous treatments of educational turmoil. Accordingly, this approach appears to be able to incorporate the data provided by earlier studies while taking factors into account which have not received the attention that appears to be their due.

Defining Scope

A variety of terms have been applied to that range of phenomenon we call educational turmoil. The labels "protest", "activism", "resistence", and "turmoil" are generic terms which subsume qualitatively and quantitively different actions. Typically, the person who, on only one or two occasions, participates in a sit-in or another such action (any one of which constitutes the operational definition of activism) has typically been treated as the equivalent of another person who almost continuously involves himself in these activities and the promotion of them. Differences between "throw-away" fashion and a more durable fabric are often camouflaged by the use of popular terminology.

Similarly, generalizations about the personality, socio-economic status, and ideology of participants in turmoil, which continued to be disseminated in 1971 (Horn and Knott, 1971) have, in the present writer's opinion, hidden the fact that the characteristics of school disrupters changed considerably prior to 1971. Gergen (1973; 1974) appears to be one of the few who noticed this, even as late as 1973-74:

> Variables that successfully predicted...activism during the early stages of the Vietnam War are dissimilar to those which might have successfully predicted activism during later periods. The conclusion seems clear that the factors motivating activism changed over time. Thus any theory of political activism built from early findings would be invalidated by later findings (Gergen, 1973, p.315).

By 1968 there was sufficient evidence (e.g. see Peterson, 1968) to conclude that "sit-ins", "actions", protest marches, demonstrations, and the like had by then become a fashionable way of lobbying for the redress of a very broad range of grievances, only some of which entailed political content as perceived by participants and observers. Accordingly, the tiny, homogeneous, politicized elites which created the first ripples of protest, were swamped eventually, by the billows of turmoil churned up by a heterogeneous mass. Yet, in the middle of 1971, writers were still defining the characteristics of activists in terms of samples taken at elite institutions such as Berkeley and the University of Chicago as long ago as 1959 and as recently as 1967! (see Horn and Knott, 1971, and The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 27, 1, 1971). While "no more than about 15% of the student body of any given institution (Horn and Knott, 1971 , p.978) may have joined a formal activist movement" the parameters which Maoists, Black Panthers, Felquistes of Weatherpeople share, must surely differ from those defining high school students like the protester who is reported to have said that he wasn't aware of the problems but "the present position of...high school students is untenable" (McGill Daily, March, 1967). When 85% of American high schools report disruption (Syracuse University Research Corporation survey cited in US News and World Report, November 30, 1970) one might wonder how one can describe all activists as being an elite -- especially an elite of the sort Flacks (1967, 1970, 1971a,b), Keniston (1967), and others described. Horn and Knott's (op.cit.) recent summary of personality data is based on the same small data pool from which Flacks and Keniston reported. However, Horn and Knott note that even in the Berkeley studies, one team of researchers found a group of activists who shared more attributes with non-activists than with other Berkeley protesters (Horn and Knott, op.cit., p.981). Even Thomas' (1971) more recent study was a replication of Flack's work in Chicago and, accordingly, tells us nothing about a population that differs from that which Flacks sampled (the conservative sample excepted),[1]

Considerations of the foregoing sort together with an assessment of reports of turmoil in less exclusive schools have led the present writer to the conclusion that the variables producing turmoil are not as homogeneous as is generally reported and that one might discern, from an examination of data from a more inclusive population, etiological covariations with the historical, political, economic, and cultural differences which published evidence suggests exist among activists, and which are known to affect the acquisition, elicitation, inhibition, disinhibition, and extinction of behavior.

---

[1] Thomas, like Flacks before him, found evidence that suggested an affinity of feeling (mutual respect and affection) as well as ideas, ideals and values between leftist activists and their parents (who tended to be economically privileged). However, Thomas also found evidence of cultural continuity in the similarly privileged families of right wing activists. The samples for both studies were, however, drawn from the student body of an exclusive university, and accordingly, the generalizations from these studies should not be used without considerable circumspection in discussions of educational turmoil, since this phenomenon became manifest in educational institutions which served populations which differed enormously (among themselves and the University of Chicago populations sampled by Flacks and Thomas). (Keniston's samples were similarly unrepresentative).

Accordingly, while the constraints on time, space, access and budget which attend any study have contributed to a present emphasis on Canadian material, an attempt is made to explore historical differences in culture and ideas which are associated with the activism of different groups both inside and outside of Canada. Following the tradition of science and thought which assumes that people's habits of thought, feeling and action have a historical and material basis, the present writer set out to explore these covariations. More specifically, this exploration was guided by the tradition of scholarship which assumes that the historical basis exerts its influence through present material manifestations. One such historical derivative, the distribution of wealth and power (which is used to structure production and social relations through patterns of reinforcement and punishment) creates and controls an ecology of models and shapes ideas, expressions, language and feeling. This suggests a connection between political economy and psychology.

In other words, the present work is based, in part, on the assumption that since the historically given material manifestations of a political economy order behavior, a historical and political analysis which focuses on the distribution of power among different groups of people in differing circumstances can provide a basis for supplementing the restricted explanatory power that inheres in the situationism of contemporary psychology in general and social learning theory in particular. Another basis for a new synthesis in the theory of political psychology is the convergence in definition and usage of the concept "power".

Certain varieties of contemporary political theory (e.g. see Neuman in Curtis, 1962; Resnick, 1973; Sedgewick, 1970; Shermerhorn, 1961; Sweezey and Huberman, 1969) are congruent with the thrust of certain empirical research and theory in the psychology of social learning (Bandura, 1971, 1969; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Berkowitz, 1964, 1972) in that the concept power, "the ability of a person to influence the behavior of others" (Bandura and Walters, 1963, p.95) is at the core of concerns in both fields and is defined in virtually identical terms in both fields.[2]

Accordingly, the present work is an attempt to produce the rudiments of a synthesis which gains explanatory power through a reduction of both economic and political naivete -- the ahistorical quality -- of social psychological theory, and the relative poverty of psychological sophistication that appears in the respective analyses of educational turmoil which have been provided by political analysts.

The activism of students then, is studied in relation to both the history and structural characteristics of political economies and the social and other material relations which derive from those characteristics and in which activists find themselves. That is the extant derivatives of the historical economic base, the superstructure of ideas, values, models and mores, in combination with the patterns of reinforcement and punishment which express the historically given distribution of power, the economic base, are examined in relation to the activists' behavior.

---

[2] Shermerhorn (1961, p.v) supplies the following definition of power as it is used in political theory: "the capacity of some persons to control the conduct of others". Neuman's (Curtis, 1962, p.163) definition is virtually identical.

The thesis organization reflects these considerations. The second (following) chapter describes the development of the phenomenon under investigation; reviews previously published works which are pertinent to this study; and provides a rationale for the approach taken herein. The third chapter consists of an analysis of the bases of critical ideas and consciousness in historical, political, economic and social contexts; an exploration of the origins and nature of ideas of "new left" groups in different historical, economic and cultural circumstances; and an examination of ideas, particularly liberal ideas, which are related to the circumstances and behavior of some activists, representatives of which groups are studied herein. The fourth chapter includes an analysis of socialist ideas which are found in association with some of the activists who are found in a series of "case studies" of turmoil; detailed descriptions and analyses of turmoil at a number of (primarily) Canadian campuses; and a description and discussion of research which suggests how ideas, arousal and activism may be related. Chapter five is devoted to an analysis and description of neo-capitalism's mass culture and possible relationships between the operational dynamic of the economic base and superstructural, social and behavioral developments which lack explicit political content but which debilitate and paralyse schools and other entities which attempt to make intellectual or critical contributions. Non-political activism is discussed within that framework as is the popularization, depoliticization and decline of activism. The sixth and concluding chapter provides a summary with a series of propositions based on research findings and which are presented as rudiments of a theory of political behavior and development.

In short, the following chapters describe the material and considerations which suggest a means of explaining: (1) how turmoil originated with a few elite, critical, informed sons and daughters of people, who, by example and training, shaped their offsprings' behavior, and who, ~~in~~ their own age groups comprised a corresponding exclusive or elite group; (2) how the economic, social and cultural system in perpetuating itself provides at the same time, the conditions which are criticized, the critical ideas, and the critics; (3) how activism is at one and the same time popularized, depoliticized, neutralized and eliminated in mass culture. In the course of the exposition, differences in the characteristics of activists with respect to the origins and content of the ideas they possessed and the actions they undertook are delineated. In other words, the present study attempts to discover, describe and explain possible differences or distinctions between activists on the basis of the origins of their activism, degree of radicalism and political erudition, character of their actions, ability to sustain activism and factors which produce atrophy of activism.

An examination of pertinent literature provides an appropriate point of departure.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction to the Subject Under Investigation

Historians tell us that on more than a few occasions students have disrupted the established routines and institutional arrangements of nation states. In Europe for example, during the 1840's students are said to have played a significant role in the revolutions of the time. Again in 1905, some Russian students left their more conventional roles to alter the course of events outside their schools. The part played by students in forcing changes in the ruling regimes of Turkey and South Korea during the 1950's represent more recent examples (as does the 1960 revolt of Japanese students). And of course the contemporary student militants in such countries as Uruguay embody a Latin American tradition of student action outside and inside the universities which dates back to 1918 when Argentine students proclaimed a programme in the "Cordoba Manifesto" which described a basis for activism that was adopted throughout Latin America (Halliday, 1969).

North American students, by contrast, have been more remarkable for their torpor. This was especially noteworthy in the 1950's. Accordingly, when, in the early 1960's, the actions of a few students disrupted the routine operation of a university, the novelty elicited such attention that a flood of ink and a persistent wind carried the seeds to other fertile fields. With each succeeding season the species spread. Protest-marches, picketing, sit-ins, strikes, demonstrations, and boycotts sprang up with increasing frequency. As Divoky (1969b) predicted, it spread to the high schools whose greatest disturbances in the past had been the endemic but furtive vandalism that schools have traditionally accepted in relative silence. As the turmoil increased, protest evolved into resistance in some areas. Officials were held captive; access to buildings was barred; classes and meetings were interrupted; threat and physical intimidation were used; and with each instance, the news of educational turmoil was disseminated along with a great variety of conjectures as to "the cause". These conjectures were frequently accompanied by either praise or condemnation of the rebellious youth and their actions. Meanwhile, as the students walked out the police walked in accompanied by mass media with their apparatus, and researchers with their questionnaires. One research group "estimated conservatively that 2000 high school rebellions" took place in the U.S.A. between November 1968 and April 1969 (The Guardian, New York, 17 May 1969; cited in Buckman 1970, p. 185). According to a Syracuse University Research Corporation survey, 85% of American high schools had experienced disruption at some time during the three year period which ended with the month of November, 1970. (U.S. New and World Report, November 30, 1970). Obviously, what initially was an aberration involving an elite few (Flacks, 1967) had become a mass phenomenon. The torpid '50's had yielded to the turbulent '60's. But why? Furthermore, why was Flacks (1971b) able to pronounce activism, at least in the U.S.A., as "defunct" in 1971, after it had reached a peak only a year or two earlier?

The number of explanations proferred is, in Finney's (1971) words "bewildering". A critical review of some of the more serious[1] endeavors is the subject of the following pages.

Theories of Activism and Related Research

Virtually all writers who have discussed the turmoil in educational institutions since 1959 have noted that the turbulence is precipitated by events about which the students have awareness and, therefore, to which they relate themselves (Kelly, 1963). Lipset and Wolin (1965) for example, describe the now famous Berkeley student protest of 1964 with its sit-ins, occupations, strikes, boycotts and so forth, as being immediately precipitated by the deprivation of a once enjoyed right. Similarly, Divoky (1969a), and Libarle and Seligson (1970) document student complaints of sacred values being violated and the aftermath. However, since the imposition of censorship, dress codes and other such unpleasant measures have not reliably produced collective enterprises which impaired the normal operation of educational institutions, scholars (and others) have attempted to discover and describe other variables which together with these events, constitute the necessary and sufficient conditions which produce turmoil.

Some scholars, notably Flacks (1967, 1970, 1971), Thomas (1971), and Trent and Craise (1967), have provided some useful sociological and psychometric information about some of the students who have been involved. These studies together with others (such as Adelson (1964); Berrion _et al_ (1967); Blair and Pendleton (1971); Cauthen _et al_ (1971); Elkin and Westley (1955, 1957); Epperson (1964); Gorsuch and Smith (1972); Horn and Knott (1971); Jahoda and Warren (1965); Kahl (1953); Meisels and Canter (1971); Milgram and Toch (1969); Morris and Small (1971); Petroni (1972);

---

[1] I have excluded the "International Communist Conspiracy" theory which if nothing else was probably offered in all seriousness by J. Edgar Hoover in _Communist Target: Youth_, Washington: H.U.A.C., 1961. S.M. Lipset's suggestion that student disturbances are related to insufficient emphasis on student athletics (S.M. Lipset's "University students and politics in underdeveloped countries," _Minerva_, 1964, III) was also excluded even though it probably merits as much attention as I give to some of the others, like Bettleheim. However, the reader will perhaps feel I erred on the side of being serious about too many silly explanations.

Remmers (1963)) present a picture of cultural continuity between the students and their parents. In the words of Horn and Knott (1971, p. 980) "The political and ethical views of activist youth were often similar to those held by their parents." Accordingly, others like Bettleheim (1971) and Feuer (1969), who promulgated the rudiments of the psychosexual and generational conflict recipe, which has been popularized in the mass media, have been misleading. Not only is there a tendency for activists and their parents to share germane values and opinions; they tend to have affection and respect for each other as well (Bay, 1967; Califano, 1970, Flacks, op. cit., Trent and Craise, op. cit.)

Other accounts which attempt to explain activism are similarly undetermined by the sociological and psychometric data. Aldridge's (1969) thesis that activists are poor and mediocre students, who, in response to repeated failure, strike out to find or make their place in the world, flies in the face of the evidence: the activists who had been studied at that time tended to be talented and successful (Bay, op. cit.; Califano, op. cit.; Flacks, op. cit.). For the same reasons the theses of Harold Taylor (1969) and Brzezinski (1968) are not altogether adequate. Although a mass of quite undistinguished adolescents eventually did join the more talented and politicized students in the disruption of schools, and accordingly through their inclusion made the activist population conform more closely to the mediocrity characterization, existing data in 1968 suggested that activists tended to have the advantages of the privileged which enable them to be more versatile in adapting to changes such as automation. They appeared to be more capable of attaining conventional success than most of their age-mates, as the people described in Weatherman Diana Oughton's biography illustrate well (Powers, 1971). Sidney Hook (1969) and Nathan Glazer (1969) who characterized activists as misguided totalitarians, also face difficulties: Bay (op. cit.), Flacks (op. cit.), Keniston (1967) among others, cite evidence which suggests that in most American cases the label "radical" denotes a liberal who takes liberal values seriously. These people embraced "participatory democracy" and anti-communism, anti-facism, and anti-elitism prevaded their thinking. However, "reformed" old leftists like Hook may have been discussing young Maoists and Leninists who, of course, formed and still form, a very small proportion of the student activists. Furthermore, in the final analysis the term "totalitarian" is only a pejorative label for particular behaviors and cannot therefore, be regarded as a precipitating condition for those behaviors.

However, the sociological and psychometric data (from Bay, Flacks, Thomas, Trent and Craise, op. cit) do not prove adequate either. To quote Keniston (op. cit.), "...more students possess the demographic and attitudinal characteristics ... than are actually involved in protests..." (p. 119). Furthermore, as suggested above, the samples studied, while probably representative of the early protestors, are not likely representative of the much larger and less elite-like population that became involved in activism.

Indeed, Keniston's (ibid) own notions about the sources of student activism, while somewhat more complex than many of those cited above, also appear to be inadequate. Since his samples were taken in the mid-1960s at exclusive institutions, Keniston (ibid), not surprisingly, found activism associated with above average socio-economic status, intelligence, humanitarianism, tolerance, open-mindedness, achievement and satisfaction with school. A tendency of activists' parents to be nurturant, non-authoritarian, affectionate, highly educated, "liberal" and affluent is also described in

Keniston's work. In addition, Keniston's material is compatible with the data of Flacks (op. cit.) and Thomas (op. cit.) which indicates that activists stress the importance of values - particularly the values of their own parents: apparently they were "living out parental values". Probably Keniston's best contribution to the understanding of activism then, is that which he shares with Flacks: activists, or at least those who were politically active and attended elite schools, learned a set of ideas from their parents and used them to construe their world in the critical terms inherent in the ideas. However, the problems with Keniston's account, one may contend, are compounded when he claims that the vast majority of dissenters, are, in childhood "...characterologically committed to one or another style of dissent..." and that socio-cultural factors or "...historical forces do not ordinarily transform radically the ... inclination of an adult..." (p. 115).

At first glance this might appear plausible given the impressive evidence for the saliency of cultural continuity as opposed to generational conflict cited above. Furthermore, as Inkeles and Levinson (1969, pp. 464-465) have reminded us, the adoption of the psychoanalytic model (Freud (1933) 1965) which has been widely used in various fields of social science has produced "substantial agreement" among such people as the clinicians and some schools of social science, that the major features of personality are given form in approximately the first six years of life. Developmental psychologists, for example, have generally accepted this orthodoxy in practice (Inkeles and Levinson, ibid, p. 468). That is, they have assumed that the "...major elements of adult personality can be predicted from the study of child-rearing practices and child personality." (Inkeles and Levinson, ibid, p. 467).[2]

However, there are several difficulties inherent in this position. First, as Inkeles and Levinson (*ibid*) have emphasized, the restrictive nature of the model has led to the neglect of postchildhood changes in personality. That is, the influences of socio-cultural factors such as occupation, conditions of work, status, wealth, location of home, political milieu, mass media, patterns of reward and punishment, and the distribution and diversity of models have been overlooked as influences on personality development in the various periods of life after childhood. "Considerations of these influences is especially important in less integrated and stable societies where the individual is confronted with changing opportunities and demands in different life periods and social contexts" (*ibid* p. 467). The resurgence of interest in life-span developmental psychology reflects an awareness of the above as Flavell (1970) and others (see Goulet and Baltes, 1970) have suggested. Nor should we forget that Freud (*op. cit*. p. 64) acknowledged that "those who [step] into the place of parents - educators, teachers, people chosen as ideal models...later parents...regularly make important contributions to the formation of character." Indeed, contemporary social

---

[2] Keniston's adoption of this orthodoxy probably stems from his well-known association with Erik Erikson. His writings reflect an incorporation of various other concepts used by that neo-Freudian such as "identity".

Bettleheim (*op. cit*.), another neo-Freudian, also emphasizes child rearing as a major factor in his speculations about the sources of activism. The pervasive influence of psychoanalytic theory is similarly seen in the work of historian Feuer (*op. cit*.) and the acceptance of the assumed primacy of child rearing practices as the major independent variable by the sociologist Flacks (*op. cit*.) further indicates the extent to which the orthodoxy is held.

learning research (eg. Bandura 1971, 1969) suggests that such influences may be far more important than psychologists have generally assumed. A second source of difficulty for those, like Keniston (op. cit.), who suggest that the behaviors of student protestors are directly linked to childhood experience is the paucity of evidence to support the "assumption ...that a particular childhood experience produces in itself, a particular childhood personality disposition, and that this disposition continues unchanged throughout life." (Inkeles and Levinson, op. cit. p. 461). If one argues that activism is a predisposition or habit acquired in childhood, then one might expect to notice the behavior in public schools before activism is seen in colleges. However, the reverse was the case. Furthermore, the value of the methodologies used for gauging the effects of variables in childhood on adult behavior has been severely truncated. Inkeles and Levinson (ibid, p. 461) in describing that state of affairs come to the conclusion that "...the relation between childhood experience and adult personality is clearly in need of further theoretical clarification and empirical research, with greater attention given to intervening events."

Keniston's theory appears to reflect a lack of understanding of these problems. Accordingly, when he claims that there are two mutually exclusive types of dissenters, "the activists" and "the alienated" (nonactivist dissenters), whose postchildhood experiences don't change the already established proclivities of dissent of each type, he lacks a theoretical basis and supporting evidence for his assertions. Indeed, evidence to the contrary is readily available.

If postchildhood experience could not change one type of dissenter into the other, it would be difficult to explain how certain Black Panthers and Weatherman members could desert to the Jesus Freaks (Plowman, 1971), why radical student leaders like Mario Savio "retired" and Ray Mungo set off to rural Vermont "in search of the New Age" (Abcarain, 1971). And since in Keniston's typology the "alienated" (non-activist) dissenters include the "beats," "hippies," and "yippies" how can he explain the activism of "beat" poet Alan Ginsberg and the activism of the "hippies" and "yippies" in such events as those in Chicago during the 1968 convention of the Democratic Party? Surely these examples along with the alternate swelling and depletion of the activists' ranks associated with the war in Vietnam, place Keniston's typology and its underlying emphasis on child rearing practices in jeopardy.[3]

Criticism and the Problem of Assuming a Perspective

In summary, a survey of the above literature suggests that attempts at explaining the turmoil of the past decade by focusing on child rearing practices, psycho-sexual conflict resolution, values, depravity, educational deficiencies and personality characteristics appear to be inadequate. This is the case not only because of the particular difficulties with each of the alleged explanations discussed above; a problem lies elsewhere as well.

---

[3] Keniston's typology of student dissenters (the "alienated" and the "activist") might well be replaced by a different typology. Clearly both groups are estranged from and deviate from the conventional or accepted range of behavior. That is, both groups are "alienated" (in his sense). Accordingly, one may argue that the label "the alienated" is less ambiguous when used as a superordinate category which subsumes the activists and those who more generally withdraw (e.g. the hippies). Furthermore, theorizing with these revisions facilitates a more coherent explanation of the phenomena in terms of habits of response to noxious stimuli as manifested in withdrawal or attack. This writer sees this as important since (1) members of each group have been observed moving to the other and (2) members in each group have shared similar representations of given conditions and events, performed similar conceptual transformations and, while reacting differently, shared a common perception of the noxious qualities inherent in given conditions, arrangements and events.

Notice might be taken of Bottomore's (1966, p. 55) observation that contemporary student activism cannot readily be separated from other movements of social criticism. This appears to imply that if one wishes to understand the phenomenon of educational turmoil, a broad cultural and political perspective is required. Perhaps Sampson (1967a) in his "Introduction" to the July, 1967 edition of the Journal of Social Issues had some sense of this when he wrote: "...so complex a phenomenon as student activism requires a knowledge that cuts across specialties and disciplines" (p. iii).

However the contributors to that edition did not assume the broad perspective Sampson (ibid) prescribed when he wrote that "one must be a developmental psychologist..., a social psychologist..., a clinical psychologist..., an historian..., a social critic..." (pp. iii-iv). All approached the phenomenon of turmoil from specialized viewpoints: each assumed only a portion of the roles listed by Sampson, and no one took the role of social critic very seriously. Trent and Craise (op. cit.) interpreted personality and attitude data. Flacks (1967, op. cit.) discussed the discontinuity between the activists' family life and the "outside" institutional world. Brown (1967) emphasized disparities between expectations and realities. Bay (op. cit.) stressed links between intelligence, attitudes and personality variables. Keniston (op. cit.) discussed child rearing practices, values and "internationalized identity". And even Sampson (1967b) only focused on twelve "institution-related factors" present on campus. In short all fall short of Sampson's (1967a, op.cit.) prescription and Bottomore's (op. cit.) implied requirements. Unfortunately, the work of Bettelheim (op. cit.) and most of the other writers discussed above have this same limitation.

Just as one's understanding of student activism is enhanced by considering its relation to social movements (the American SDS for example, "arose out of the old League for Industrial Democracy" (Mauss, 1971, p. 186) and the "New Left" more generally was "spawned and carried" by the "Old Left" (ibid.; also Feuer,1969) "little can be understood about any social movement as long as it is considered only in isolation from its host milieu" (Mauss, p. 188). This has been recognized by almost everyone from the "counter-culture" exponents like Roszak (1969) and Reich (1970) to the more critical scholars like Cockburn and Blackburn (1969), Gray (1966, a, b, c, 1970), Griffith (1970), Kolakowski (1969), Lasch (1969), Laxer (1970), Oglesby (1969), and many others. A complex of themes of cultural criticism, developed out of social, economic and political analyses are associated in the writings of the scholarly social critics and, in more fragmented, isolated and emasculated form, in the utterances of "pop" critics. Accordingly, forming part of the cultural milieu are institutions whose function is that of criticism. The "pop" critics are part of mass culture and the scholarly critics (from whom some content is borrowed by the pop critics) are mainly in the universities, part of whose function is to disseminate the past and existing criticisms of social, political and cultural arrangements. The ideas, "issues", the ideology of the activists are therefore given by the culture's formal intellectual and informal, non-intellectual apparatus. One's understanding of activism is accordingly dependent upon a comprehension of the ideas being disseminated by the popular and scholarly critics.

However, even a familiarity with the content of activists' thoughts does not explain the dynamics of student activism. Indeed, those like Charles Reich (op. cit.) (and many of the activists and the intellectuals who supply political, economic and social criticisms) who assume that "consciousness" is the key variable, have to explain why many smokers who are well informed of the dangers of doing so, continue to smoke. That is to ask, why do some people not become activists even when they have an understanding and committment to the various ideas held by activists?[4]

Nevertheless, ideas are obviously important. One of the conclusions drawn from Loken's (1970) study of correlates of activism was that an exposure to ideas was the most significant sociological variable related to activism. Accordingly, the following pages include a discussion of ideas which were found to be espoused by activists involved in turmoil. However, as we have seen above, a naive rationalistic explanation cannot account for the non-activism of persons who have the same ideas as activists. In short, what is required is a theory which can link ideological and motivational factors (Mauss, 1971, p. 186). The results of an attempt to develop some rudiments of such a theory is the subject matter of this dissertation.

---

[4] At least as early as the mid-nineteenth century some intellectuals had noticed that one must distinguish between actual behavior and consciousness. The works of Darwin, Marx, and later, Freud, embody evidence of this (e.g. Freud, 1965; see also Barzun, 1958; and Wagar, 1966). Indeed, this distinction is fundamental to modern sociology and psychology. Accordingly, Piaget (quoted in Bottomore and Rubel, 1963, p. 63) wrote:

> "The great merit of Marx is that he made a distinction in social phenomena, between an effective basis and a superstructure which oscillates between symbolism and an adequate consciousness, in the same sense (and Marx himself explicitly says this) as psychology is obliged to make a distinction between actual behavior and consciousness.... The social superstructure stands in the same relation to its basis as does the individual consciousness to behavior...."

Since the foregoing considerations have suggested that critical ideas are apparently associated with activism; that parents and other models have been found to be the transmitters of these ideas to the youthful protestors; and that the formulations and learning of these critical ideas presupposes a political and economic base and social relations within which, and with respect to which, the ideas are formed and learned, an exploration of the basis and contents of these critical ideas and the nature of the organs of their expression follows. Furthermore, since the possession of ideas implies consciousness as well, a theoretical analysis of the roots of consciousness is the point of departure in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

HISTORY, POLITICAL ECONOMY AND CONSCIOUSNESS

Dependency, Power and Cultural Transmission: The Roots of Cultural Continuity and Consciousness

One may conceive of consciousness as a person's set of cognitive habits, these habits being both the tools and content of consciousness. Such a conception of consciousness involves the notion that the modes of representation, ordering and processing of information in recurring patterns, are acquired and modifiable through social interaction with a verbal community. The language and other symbol systems used by man are themselves embodiments of habits used to represent, order and process the myriad of stimuli encountered by our sense receptors. These habits of managing information are shaped by the verbal community into which a given person is born. Symbols, symbol systems, shared definitions and common experience with their referents, constitute part of what is called the culture of a given society. In other words, a shared culture is to some degree a shared set of cognitive habits -- a commonality of consciousness. The progeny of each generation learn the society's common social behavior and "habits of mind" by interacting with their families and other members of society.

Parental Power and Childhood Dependency: Establishing Control

Those upon whom the helpless infant depends for nurturance have power over the child by virtue of the child's dependence. The dispensing and withholding of that which alleviates an infant's discomfort or elicits pleasurable arousal in the child, produces generalized imitation of the parent or surrogate parent by the child. Responses which successively approximate the behaviors typical of the society are instrumental in procuring reinforcement from the members of that society. By these and other processes of social learning (Bandura, 1971, 1969; Bandura and Jeffery, 1973; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Bandura, Ross and Ross, 1963a, 1963b; Gerwirtz and Stingle, 1968; Skinner, 1953, 1971; Walters and Parke, 1964; Walters, Parke and Crane, 1965) the cognitive, as well as the other social habits of the culture, are transmitted to each succeeding generation. In adult life the powerful maintain these habits by virtue of their possession of the means of dispensing and withholding the culture's rewards and punishments. By such means deviance is "managed" and cultural continuity is ensured.

Owner Power and Worker Dependence: Maintaining Control

As each generation uses its power to shape its successor, the distribution of power between classes maintains itself from generation to generation. The extent to which a class can maintain control of the means of production is related to the extent to which it maintains control of ideology and consciousness. Accordingly, the psychological process of learning is also a political process in that power is used to perpetuate the existing order (as opposed to alternative orders). That is to say, that power is used to reproduce a historically given distribution of power, and that order's culture or collective habits (which includes habits of thought).

Similarly, the worker -- that is, anyone who must (to live) sell, exchange, or allow his living energy to be harnessed by and for the aims of others who have thepower to make the workers' livelihood contingent upon the worker's satisfactory (in the eyes of the owners or their proxies) performance, (and often other attributes, e.g. demeanor) -- the non-owner is dependent on owners. (Even "management" workers (non-owners), whose functions are proxy functions, are dependent). Thus, the economic process and relations of production, are also political and psychological processes through which the status quo is preserved.

In this manner (supplemented with military and other influences) the commercial or bourgeois class has maintained its position of dominance to the present day in all but the socialist countries of the world. Since the present work is an attempt to understand the educational turmoil in some of the liberal states, we are compelled by considerations of the sort discussed immediately above, to examine the nature of liberalism if we are to understand liberal consciousness and criticism. But first we must consider the basis of this consciousness. The ideas, definitions of reality, the ways of thinking, the habits of mind which are passed from one generation to the next, and some of the sources of change, variability, and deviance which one may associate with criticism arise from a material base.

Political and Economic Dimensions of Consciousness: Structure, Super-structure, Rulers and Rules

Marx (in Fromm, 1961, p.17) argued that

> ...in the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite state of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitute the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production...conditions...intellectual life... Social being...determines...consciousness.

Accordingly, since "the production of ideas...of consciousness, is

...directly interwoven with the material activity and material intercourse of men..." (Marx, ibid, p.20), the differences between states in their institutionalized patterns of production, distribution, and consumption produce corresponding differences in consciousness between the people of such states. In terms of Marxian (Bottomore and Rubel, 1963, p.92-93) analysis, existing relations of production between persons are recapitulated in legal definitions, political relations and ideology. A ruling class is the dominant material force in society due to the fact that it controls the means of material production. With such power a class codifies and enforces the relations of production in law, politics and culture. Control of the means of material production enables the class to control "the means of mental production". Accordingly, the dominant ideas express the dominant material relationships. Ideology, that is, ideas serving as weapons for social interests produced by the rulers (as thinkers and as controllers of the means of material production) reinforces the existing power relationships: the ideas of the rulers become the ideas of the ruled. The power of language, concepts, ideas and logic are therefore additional instruments of social control at the disposal of the ruling class. By these means the powerful can successfully represent their own interests as the general interest or good.

Following Marx, Fromm (1962, p.71) showed how the idea that the "economic basis is translated into the ideological structure" is plausible. He argued that "language, by its words, its grammar, its syntax, by the whole spirit which is frozen in it, determines which experiences penetrate to our awareness." Logic, he added, is a second filter which makes awareness possible and "directs the thinking in a given culture" (ibid, p.119). Together these "filter" mechanisms form the basis of a "social unconsciousness"[1] which, when combined with the ideological consciousness (which the filters and other concrete forces shape) can be said to form a national or class character. Persons from a similar milieu characteristically construe the phenomena they encounter in a common fashion. According to this logic, neocapitalist economies operated by bourgeois societies tend to produce what might be variously called liberal, bourgeois or neocapitalist mentality. Similarly, socialist economies tend to produce socialist consciousness. In Marxian terms then, if social being determines consciousness and "the ideas of the ruling class are, in every age, the ruling ideas" (Marx, in Bottomore and Rubel, 1963, p.93), the ideas, the criticism of people in neocapitalist economies tend to be cast in liberal or bourgeois terms. Human reality is socially constructed reality (Berger and Luckman, 1967) and as such, it tends to be apprehended and described in terms of the typical schemes which are "ideal expressions of the dominant material relationships" (Marx, op.cit., p.93).

Relations of Production and Criticism: Division of Labour as a Source of Criticism

However, a number of factors may diminish the degree of ruling class control of consciousness. One of these is division of labour. Within the contemporary liberal state, for example, culture is so industrialized (Birnbaum, 1971) that social criticism and other intellectual work is professionalized and institutionalized. One could, as Marx (1963, pp. 93-94) did, detect this division and its potential for rending ruling

---

[1] The patterns of reinforcement by which the members of a society are controlled would be included by the present writer among those factors which shape a collective or social unconscious. That is patterns of rewarding some behaviors and not other behaviors produces a set of habits (reflexive or unconscious behavior) which are common to the people of a given society.

class solidarity and control in the mid-nineteenth century and earlier. Marx (ibid) pointed to such a division of labour within the ruling class itself when intellectuals were referred to by him as "the thinkers of the (bourgeois) class"; and their fellow class members who were said to "have less time to make up ideas and illusions" because of their busyness in their business were called "the active members of this (bourgeois) class". The relatively greater amount of industrialization and specialization of the mid-twentieth century (which required that the thinkers "of" the owning class be augmented by hirelings who were not "of" the owning class and who, in exchange for advantages over other wage workers, would think "for" the ruling class) might portend an even greater diminution of ruling class control of consciousness. The elaboration of the division of labour, furthermore, enables (and sometimes forces) some intellectual workers "to make up ideas and illusions" in spaces which are somewhat remote from the productive apparatus (e.g. when one is unemployed due to a surplus of specialists in one's field). Being removed or remote from the productive apparatus and in possession of habits of criticism the excercise of which has been reinforced, these intellectuals may, by successive stages come to criticize and reject the whole system or some major aspect of it. Thus a cleavage within the ruling class, or between owners and those who exchange their thoughts for a livelihood, may develop into a certain opposition and "hostility between the two parts" (ibid, p.94) which becomes codified in ideas that might criticize and challenge the control of the ruling class. Furthermore, since there is an international character to the intercourse between scholars, they and their students may sometimes become acquainted with ideas which were developed in different milieux. These ideas may provide a powerful basis for criticizing the existing arrangements, and permit the construction of alternative representations of their world as it might be, and/or should be. The dissemination of such ideas in the home society may, then, also decrease the effectiveness of ruling class control of ideas.

The Dialectic in History: The Past and Foreign in the Here and Now As Sources of Criticism

Another factor which may diminish ruling class control of consciousness is the persistence of, or the material manifestations of the residues of history. More specifically, if the history of a people includes a succession of different ruling orders its present culture will reflect that fact. The language and folklore, the customs and traditions, the mores and institutions of any given society embody the net effects of a people's history. Sometimes when one class succeeds another in power, the succeeding class maintains (or may be able to get rid of) parts of the old order even though the means and relations of the production are changed radically; for the new rulers are not omnipotent and history is not easily abolished. Accordingly, the English bourgeoisie, for example, maintained the Church, retained the lords and other institutions of the preceding aristocratic order of feudalism. The residues of the past in interaction with the prevailing order may provide a basis for class consciousness and, therefore, the class conflict which produces a set of ideas and criticism that compete with the self-justifying illusions, the apologetic ideology of the bourgeoisie. If class consciousness develops and persists, a vehicle of criticism is by definition institutionalized: a tradition is established which is reinforced or maintained by the inherent conflict of interests in the liberal state. Some scholars (see footnote 3) have argued that "new" societies which consciously broke their ties to the traditions associated with aristocracy and the feudal order, thereby created conditions which precluded the establishment of criticism based on class consciousness. However, even in such states, the instruments with which surgery was performed on the past, when institutionaled e.g. the American Constitution, may themselves produce difficulties for ruling class control. They may impede or preclude actions of adjustment that are necessary for the rulers to make in order to maintain control in changed circumstances.

Nevertheless, each country's history produces its own peculiar varieties of criticism. However, as is inevitable in a world made smaller by technology, each country's stock of ideas is, like plants growing close together, cross-pollinated by the stock of other nations. In such a world the winds of change carry the seeds of thought to all points. No species is likely to remain pure, and no prevailing wind, transitory breeze or tempestuous storm can avoid carrying the products of dialectical intercourse all over the world. Events on an international plane, especially those that take place in and between the more powerful states, have always affected the evolution of ideas. In spite of this, countries, especially those in Europe which had institutionalized vehicles of criticism produced a different set of ideas than did countries without such institutions. Nations with established communist or socialist parties which shared a comprehensive, coherent critique of capitalism with religious groups and segments of the universities, produced sets of ideas and analyses differing in character from the ideas developed in states whose history deprived them of traditions and institutions which embodied non-liberal ideas and examples. However, international intercourse could affect both varieties.

The "New" Criticism: The New Left in Social-Historical Perspective

Due to factors discussed above, the new criticism that appeared to gain force in the late 1950's was new in a different sense in Britain for example, than in the USA. The New Left in Britain was more of a revitalization -- a resurgence of an ongoing tradition of criticism which was institutionalized in class consciousness, politics, the universities, and the religious tradition of the social gospel. By contrast, The New Left in the United States was new in a quite different sense. A radical or socialist tradition had never been established in the USA. The small pockets of radicalism which survived from the purges and persecution of the first three decades of ~~the~~ twentieth century were, in spite of a brief regrouping in the thirties, forced into oblivion by the Second World War and its aftermath. Cold War anti-communism and McCarthyism represented the American tradition of hostility to that which was "unAmerican". A species of thought which challenged the premises and content of the American Dream could not long endure. The anatchic traffic, created by the competitive pursuit of happiness which each shopper in the garden of commerce defined in terms of rags to riches, would destroy that flower which was not protected by tradition. And tradition in the USA had to be liberal since the state was created by, and institutionalized the ideas of bourgeois revolutionaries.[2] Socialism, collectivism, communism, co-operativism, were weeds; capitalism, individualism, liberalism and competition were flowers in America. Accordingly, the American New Left was a hybrid: it was a fusion of American mainstream or traditional liberal criticism

anarchic

---

[2] Perhaps they were more separatist than revolutionary.

and imported varieties from Europe -- particularly from Britain.

Canada's New Left was also a hybrid. However, the Canadian variety differed from its American counterpart due to differences in the two countries' histories.

The creation of the American republic was both an earlier and a more abrupt development than the emergence of the Canadian state. The USA was a revolutionary creation but Canada was an evolutionary product. While the founding of the United States -- its "point of departure" from Britain -- is sharply marked in time by a War of Independence, Canada's "departure from Europe" was gradual and indefinite.[3] Canada, in contrast to the USA, did not repudiate the ties to her past, whereas, the first American republic was created by the performance of surgery on her roots. Accordingly, the United States' political culture was generally "fixed" by a colonial bourgeoisie in "the Age of Mercantilism". In writs sanctified by the victory of a class which fought for the severance of historically given impediments to its individual members' "pursuit of happiness" (i.e. self-interest defined as private accumulation), the ideology of mid-eighteenth century entrepreneurs was canonized for their posterity in the USA. By contrast, Canada's political culture was not "fixed" by comparable events. The British bourgeoisie in learning that their overseas interests could be maintained and even protected, by the gradual granting of de jure independence, preempted any Canadian repudiation of connections with Britain. Ideas and people could continue to come from Britain to Canada and not be regarded as alien or un-Canadian. As a consequence, the large nineteenth century infusion of British immigrants who carried a developed class consciousness and socialist ideas to Canada, did not have to repudiate or abandon their past. Furthermore, their presence, together with the presence of those who gave Canada the "touch" of a Tory tradition (e.g. The United Empire Loyalists), those that represented a variety of Whiggery (e.g. The Family Compact), and those who retained the traditions of feudal collectivism (e.g. the French Canadians) provided a basis for the institutionalization of an ideological diversity in Canada. The history of the USA precluded that sort of development.

---

[3] The present discussion of the differences between the American and Canadian political cultures and their relationships to the differences in the two countries' respective histories, relies heavily on G. Horowitz's "Conservatism, liberalism, and socialism in Canada: an interpretation, "The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science XXXII, 2, May, 1966, 143-171. An abridged form of this article was also published in three installments in The McGill Daily (December 9, 1966; January 20, 1967; February 16, 1967).

The United States had rejected the feudal remnants or Tory institutions which carried collectivist ideas when she fought for and won independence. In so doing, she abolished the basis for the development of a socialist tradition. With no institution or group present to assert the primacy of the collective interest, with no entity to define individual interests in terms of the well-being of the collective, class and community interests were not likely seen by those whose eyes were filled by the individual.

By contrast, Canada's history provided a basis for an assertion of the collective interest. Continuity with the past ensured the presence of people who asserted that the individual's interest is best defined in terms of the collective's well-being and that the individual must be constrained for the collective good. The maintenance of ties with Britain, the continuity of traditions, enabled Canada to retain elements from the past which provided an ideological heterogeneity out of which a tradition of socialist thought could be maintained. From the beginning, the threatening American presence underscored the fact that for Canada, well-being depended upon continuity. Self-interest for Canada was defined in collective terms: the maintenance of ties to the British family -- the Empire -- were seen as a source of strength. Accordingly, a spirit of cohesion of interests and continued coviviality pervaded the relationship between the United Kingdom and the British Crown's new Dominion. This was in contrast to the fragmentation of interest and denial of continuity which accompanied the birth of the American republic.

Horowitz (see footnote 3) has argued that the historical differences between the USA and Canada discussed above, account, at least in part, for the fact that a tradition of socialist criticism was institutionalized in Canada while no such tradition flourished in the USA. Accordingly, the New Left in Canada had an established legitimacy and tradition from which it could draw energy, example and wisdom. The fact that it was impregnated with the seed of the American variety of New Left and thereby exhibited traits of that species (Laxer, in Lumsden, 1970) does not detract from the fact that the New Left in Canada was "new" more in the sense that Britain's New Left was "new", than in the American sense. In summary, Canada's New Left was a resurgence of an established "un-American tradition" of socialist thought and action which was rooted in the same soil as the CCF-NDP (Caplan and Laxer in Lumsden, ibid) and the Canadian peace movement (Moffat, circa 1970), while the American New Left was the issue of liberal criticism and imported ideology (Lasch, 1969).

In contrast with the Anglo-Canadian variety, the New Left in French-speaking Quebec was "new" more in the American sense: it was probably a fusion of a renaissance of liberal reform (McGill Daily, October 13, 1967, p.3) which followed the urbanization and secularization of the populace during and after World War II, and imported radical ideology (LaTouche, 1968). However, the observation, via television and travel, of colonies gaining their independence and nations successfully fighting the "new imperialism", may have been a very significant factor. Similarly, with increasing numbers travelling more and studying longer, the literature of France's radical and socialist tradition undoubtedly became more familiar to the new intelligensia of the province. Evidence of this became manifest when, in 1958, the French universities of Quebec were struck by a student body which had adopted a syndicalist charter that originated in France (LaTouch, 1968) (also The Carillon, March 17, 1965, p.2).

France, of course, like the Netherlands, West Germany, Sweden, Italy and Britain, has a well-established tradition of leftist politics. Accordingly, the New Left in these countries was again a resurgence of leftist activities in the face of developments in the world to which all were witness and in which some participated. It was not the appearance of a new species of criticism. Developments merely stimulated more vigorous activity from people representing an old established tradition.

Before treating the developments which stimulated the carriers of an incipient leftist tradition to embark on more vigorous activity and created a "new" left in the USA, a discussion of the differences between bourgeois or liberal consciousness and criticism, and socialist consciousness and criticism is in order.

The Disorder of Liberalism and Liberal Consciousness

The bourgeois revolution in Europe which marked the end of the feudal or medieval economic system, at the same time signalled the beginning of the industrial age and the liberal economic order.[4] As competing economies developed they expanded to all points on the compass. These new empires constituted the basis of a world-wide economic system which, although modified, has persisted to the present day. The habits of thought, the ideology which developed along with this economic order have also been sustained. However, the new order was also a new disorder.

Technological developments and applications, together with the competitive ethos made more men more capable of being more brutal to more people than ever before. As history was made tradition was destroyed. Old vices became new virtues. Greed came to be called progress. The collectives of family and community were fragmented. Individual control replaced social control. A social conception of wealth gave way to an individualist conception. Competitive production ousted controlled production. Greed superceded need. Man conceived as fatally imperfect and therefore dependent upon sources beyond himself, became man the perfectible by virtue of an alleged self-sufficient reason and initiative. New material conditions, in short, created new social relationships. Where once individual well-being was regarded as the outcome of action socially controlled, the capitalist system established the precedence of the doctrine that well-being was a function of action individually controlled. Where consideration for social well-being was the inner principle of medieval economic life and competition was controlled, consideration for individual well-being came the credo of capitalism and competition was encouraged. Accordingly, along with the unquestionable benefits, such as the development of science and other material improvements of the developing liberal economy, came the horrors of the industrial towns, industrial labour, mass dislocation of community and other brutalizing conditions and arrangements which people like Marx and Engels described so vividly.

---

[4] The present discussion concerning liberalism is based on the works of Hacker (1970); Kaufman (1970); Laski (1962); Macpherson (1965); Marx (Bottomore and Rubel, 1963,; Fromm, 1961, 1962); Nisbet (1966); Shapiro (1958); and Sedgwick (1970).

The productive relations between men had changed, and these relations produced a new ideology to justify the new practices. Relations changed from stable co-operation in subsistence community to anarchic competition for individual surplus accumulation. When the relatively static and sacred feudal order was weakened by a new cosmology, technical invention, geographical discovery, a renaissance of secular learning, and a fragmentation of the Church, the commercial class was able to challenge the power of a class that ruled by virtue of privileged birth and creed. As a reaction to those interests which curbed enterpreneurial adventure, the commerical class proclaimed the virtue of liberty from restraint; they represented their own (property) interests as the general good. Progress was alleged to be the consequence of individual liberty or freedom from restraint. As the freedom of the individual entrepreneur to exploit the full wealth-producing capability of the means of production is constrained by any collective action, the capitalists sought to limit the ambit of political or collective action. And since existing authority is conservative and the existing authorities were church and state, the capitalist's interests were best served by limiting their authority as much as possible. Accordingly, a system of rights was proclaimed which confined the business of government within the framework of constitutional principle, while at the same time creating the conditions which were necessary for business to proceed in the piece-meal shaping of the world to its own purposes. This transformation was necessary since tradition, stability and collective authority were the enemies of private adventure and gain. By capturing and transforming the power of the state, business ensured the right to wealth accumulation with minimum interference from social authority of any kind. Furthermore, a capture of the coercive power of society presented possibilities for using that power for business ends. Ideological justification of this was embodied in the notion of man's perfectability, self-actualization, or progress through individual initiative in the pursuit of wealth. The justification for changed social relations was that the individual pursuit of wealth, and individual accumulation of it, was good for all men.

When the comercial class or bourgeoisie captured the state and possessed the means of production, their ideas became "the ruling ideas" and man's consciousness was fragmented. The material intercourse of men within such states was characterized by discontinuous transitory and competitive relationships. Self-interest was defined in anti-social, or at least asocial terms. For each man was to define happiness for himself and pursue it with competitive zeal. The reification of individual autonomy and competition fragmented man's relation to man. In doing so, it also fragmented man's consciousness which, because it is "manifestly social", betrays in itself the characteristics of the social relations that form it (e.g. see Marx, 1963, pp.85-86, 90-92).

Not surprisingly then, the ideology of liberalism was not a clear-cut or coherent doctrine (Laski op.cit., p.13) (also Kaufman, 1970, pp.4-9 and Shapiro, 1958, p.9). Though the system of fundamental rights was always expressed as a universal, "the individual for whose rights it has been zealous has always been an abstraction upon whom its benefits could not, in fact, be fully conferred" (Laski op.cit., p.15). Liberalism's sacred right to property was incompatible with the fulfillment of other rights -- especially those of "the man who had nothing but his labour-power to sell" and those of the collective as a whole. Property ordered law; andlabour was ordered by both. Private enterprise began with, and indeed its operational viability depended upon, the fact some people owned property while others did not. Accordingly, "freedom of contract" could not truly be free since the bargainers had unequal bargaining power. In competition, furthermore, there had to be losers as well as winners. Thus labour harnessed by capital reproduced the very chains by which its subservience was maintained and entrenched (Perlman, 1970). Accordingly, freedom to acquire was at the same time freedom to exploit; it was the basis of the wage or salary earner's lack of freedom -- to do other than acquire, and even that was to be done on the capitalist's terms.

Since the promised freedoms for all have not and cannot be fulfilled, a basis of criticism is given. Under these conditions, as suggested above, the criticism of liberal society's members tends to be cast in terms of liberal ideas i.e. absence of freedom. This is particularly characteristic of societies lacking institutional remnants of the pre-liberal era. Furthermore, suggested solutions tend to be in the liberal manner, piece-meal reformism. The liberal critic does not, like the radical (socialist) go to the root of problems since the liberal state and liberal idealism are accepted: for liberals, including liberal critics, "the optimum mix of freedom and desires" is the ultimate goal. The liberal critic can always find a deficiency of freedom somewhere, if for no other reason than his ideals are abstractions with little purchase on a specifiable concrete reality; and the freedoms are discrete and do not constitute an ideology which is coherent and internally consistent. Problems are seen as abberations which can be successfully attended to as discrete phenomena. The political economy is not treated as an organic or unified system, as a reverbating network with structural properties which, as host to an interdependent population, conditions the actions of that population. A fragmented consciousness deals with the elemental, the part, instead of the fundamental or whole structure. The liberal does not, like all socialists (Sedgwick, 1970, p.40) take the base -- the mode of production -- as that "which sets the terms for analysis and prescribes the opportunities for action". Accordingly, he "manages" politics and problems. He trades off one difficulty for another. He is ever shifting from one priority to another as the endemic problems of capitalism compete for his attention: yesterday's "priority" was inflation, today's "problem" is unemployment, tomorrow's "issue" is pollution.

Capitalism, then whether "neo", "anarcho", "cockroach" or "monopoly", creates a fragmented consciousness (Gorz, in Oglesby, 1969, pp.41-46; Williams, 1968, pp.41-44, 182), mystifies reality (Toynbee, 1967) and creates and encourages anti-intellectualism (Gorz, op.cit., pp.44-45). Accordingly, the relations between elements in a deterministic world are obscured. The liberal sees these elements as he sees people: they are separate, discrete, unconnected, autonomous, individual. Thus, in Williams' (op.cit., p.182) words

> ...a discontinuity between old and new kinds of

> demands and between the areas of the new demands themselves, is not accidental, but a precise consequence of the character of the ruling system... The problems of poverty and homelessness...of racial discrimination, of low wages, of militarism, of the control of communications, of war, disturbance and hunger in the poor two-thirds of the world, come through discontinuously and we find ourselves moving our attention from this to that; in a desperate competition of priorities set against limited resources and time...The reason for the fragmentation, the discontinuity...is a characteristic of the system as it is experienced ...What is not normally done is to connect the issues, and to follow them through to a political and economic system.

This is the social reality that produces political apathy for most and single-issue politics for a smaller number. When citizens of neo-capitalist society do concern themselves with social problems, they typically treat the problems as discrete abberations which are assumed to be amenable to "tinkering" or reformist treatment without changing the structural contradictions which create them. Sharing a fragmented consciousness -- a neo-capitalist mentality -- the relationship between the problem and the structure of the whole political economy is not perceived by them. Seemingly oblivious of the art of liberal politics (that of "persuading people that they make decisions while ensuring that they do not"; Griffith, 1970, p.19) liberals maintain faith in electoral processes and lobby, sometimes publicly, for the redress of a given grievance -- the roots of which remain uncovered. Extra-parliamentary activity for the possessor of bourgeois consciousness is characteristically public lobbying involving a single issue.

The Early American New Left as a Liberal Left: Elicitation of a Traditional Expression

The early (circa 1959 -- circa 1965) American New Left, for example, in its essential characteristics was a liberal left. Its early activities were directed by liberal ideals. The rhetoric and ideology were liberal. Furthermore, as a body, it reproduced the incipient anarchism of the liberal society which produced it. And underlying premises of the whole enterprise were liberal premises. For example, its "Civil Rights" activities (notice the emphasis on "rights") were a series of discrete attempts to make _de jure_ rights _de facto_ by a strategy of gradualism based on precedent. Voter registration, a keynote activity of the Civil Rights people betrayed the left-liberal's (1) faith in "the System's" ability to produce worthwhile self-reform, (2) assumption that if everyone exercised their rights the System would work in a just manner, (3) premise that voters had the opportunity to choose between fundamentally different alternatives, (4) belief that universal participation in electoral politcs would produce progressive measures that would remedy each of the defects that were perceived. The early American New Left appeared to operate on the notion that it could "as a generator of challenges, of critical energy and ideas...bear...fruit _within_ the evolving structures of _enlightened_ capitalism" (emphasis added) (Oglesby, 1969, p.17). The incipient anti-intellectualism of America's liberal mass culture was also manifested in the ideology of the early American New Left. The eighteenth century idealism of the bourgeoisie which was institutionalized in the American Constitution and the jingoistic creed of "the American way" (and which lacked internal coherence and logical consistency) circumscribed the depth, breadth, and quality of the New Left's ideology. (In fact, New Leftists, in the fashion of the 1950's described themselves as "anti-ideological". They did this not because they knew what ideology was). (Jacobs and Landau, 1966, p.28). Accordingly, no coherent system of ideas guided their actions. Enlightenment through persuasion -- the old liberal formula -- was both root and branch of the early American New Left (Buckman, 1970, p.31). In terms of organization its liberal lineage was manifested again. Planning was done, when it was done, on an ad hoc piece-meal basis; the liberal's romantic faith in a naive conception of what was "natural" (e.g. autonomous and rational man) was manifested in an emphasis on "spontaneity." Systematic organization was disfavored as was the notion that continuity in leadership is an advantage. In summary, the premises, mode of operation and organizational characteristics were as liberal as the society of which this New Left was a part.

All of the criticisms of the early American New Left had been made before. The NAACP, for example, had defined and worked for the mitigation of virtually all the civil rights "issues" taken on by the young activists. A liberal literary criticism had, again in piece-meal fashion, exposed the sterility of life in the crass, mass culture. The journalism and novels of the Progressive Era's muckrakers, the poetry of the "beats", the barbs of the literary left and the treatises of the culture critics presented a broad array of "issues" or "causes". However, without an ideology to connect "the issues" to their common source, without a tradition of socialism institutionalized in the state's political life, and in the face of intellectuals declaring that ideology was dead, the consciousness of the early American New Leftists was characteristic of their fellow countrymen: fragmented and liberal. Accordingly, their early efforts were aimed at bringing about concrete manifestations of the abstract ideals of American liberalism. They accepted the liberal state and tried to rectify what was considered to be its debasement. Without a socialist utopia and analysis they could not have been expected to see that this rectification was illusory due to the contradictions of a mature capitalism whose etiology had been produced by the liberal state (Laski op.cit., p.31). They appear to have believed, in accordance with the prevailing opinion of the day, that the problems or issues they saw, were consequences of technical or managerial flaws, too much organization, poor decisions and evil men. The trite phrases such as "breakdown in communication" which were used to explain problems reflected this mentality. In the same vein, "bureaucracy", "organization", "hierarchies" and "leaders" were villains: "Leaders mean organization, organization means hierarchy, and hierarchy is undemocratic. It connotes bureaucracy and impersonality..." and that is what produces "alienation" (which, when defined, was bereft of Marxian meaning) (Jacobs and Landau, op.cit., p.31). According to Jacobs and Landau (ibid, pp.31-32) racism was not connected to economics until SDS injected C. Wright Mill's imported but transformed analysis into the civil rights movement. Even then, however, the ruling class control of consciousness can be seen in the solutions which were believed to be capable of solving the problems.

Perhaps only a person with a fragmented consciousness could believe, as many New Leftists appeared to believe, that it is possible and desirable for everyone to "have a say" in all the decisions that affect his or her life. Nevertheless, this was the core of that which was denoted by American New Leftists' use of that ambiguous term "particpatory democracy". The belief that if everyone had a vote, "had his say", expressed his opinions, the appropriate decisions would be made, is an abstract principle associated with rhetoric of liberal, as well as participatory, democracy. Both also held that bureaucracy and organization thwarted the individual's freedom to pursue whatever he defined as happiness. The liberal's conceptual heritage and other "habits of mind" cast the solution in terms of eliminating the collective organization. The cult of the individual made it "self-evident" that the unfettered individual could and would make his own paradise. A highly organized and disciplined vanguard with solutions defined in collective terms was unAmerican. Accordingly, "from the beginning the Movement gave the system every benefit of the doubt" (Oglesby, op.cit., p.14).

Despite this liberal "mainstream" content the movement was a "new" left. The scattered remnants of what constituted a challenge to the liberal consensus during the 1930's now acquiesced to the hegemony of corporate capitalism. Indeed, former radicals were among the shrillest anti-communists (e.g. see Lasch, 1969 and Abcarain, 1970) and the New Left's most indignant and bitter opponents (e.g. Sidney Hook) as well as the American Way's most vocal apologists (see Lasch, op.cit.). The "old leftists", now called "corporate liberals", having been embarrassed by Stalin and made comfortable by sharing the post-war prosperity which were "the goods" allegedly "delivered" by an unexpectedly resilient and adaptive Keynsian capitalism, regarded C. Wright Mills and the "house Marxists" as "old fashioned" purveyors of dangerous "dogma". Accordingly, when the young activists, upon feeling the System's resistance in the concrete forms of cattle prods, dogs and bullets, began to show interest in Mills, Marcuse, and Muste, the vituperative attacks by the "old left" may have reinforced their propensity to arm themselves with more coherent ideas. Direct experience gave concrete meaning and justification to the abstractions of these men. Accordingly, emphasis was given to the importance of direct action.

One of the characteristics that defined this left as "new" was its emphasis on direct action or confrontation. Those who came to be so identified had not worked out a strategy to gain power: in the first years of the 1960's especially, actions were most often unplanned reactions to immediate and noxious conditions. Ideas and strategies were developed on the spot. The immediate source of inspiration for the direct action approach, however, came from the example of students in Turkey, South Korea, Cuba, Japan (Mills, in Jacobs and Landau, 1966, p.112) and a few American blacks in the South.

Eliciting Stimuli

In 1960, the world's attention was drawn to the plight of the Blacks of South Africa by the Sharpeville massacre. This, and a series of events in the American South which again raised questions about the hypocrisy of American reaction to the South Africa affair, compelled people to look at the lot of the Afro-Americans. One of these incidents may have taught the critical lesson on the tactics of direct action.

Furor over the use of federal troops in enforcing integration in Little Rock, Arkansas, a long bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama and the forced eviction of black tenant farmers who attempted to vote in Tennessee drew the attention of the American mass media to the South. When four freshmen from an all-Negro college in a "spontaneous" gesture sat-in on the segregated lunch counter of a Woolworth store in Greensboro, North Carolina, the idea of direct action was spread with rapidity. Within a month students were being arrested and expelled from schools in the South and northern whites came to the South to assist them. Martin Luther King gave his immediate support as well. In October, 1960, the Student Non-violent Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC) was formed in Atlanta, Georgia with the aid of a meat-packers union and northern student donations (Buckman, 1970); and the experience of this group of students influenced the character of subsequent student activism all over the USA and elsewhere including Canada (e.g. see The Carillon, January 21, 1966, p.2.)[5] Direct action was the element which was common to the New Left students throughout the capitalist world and educational turmoil was one result of its application.

Discovery of Praxis

The adoption of this approach to dealing with grievances may well have been one of the factors which transformed some liberal student activists into socialists and revolutionaries. Gray (1966a, b, c) argued that it is only through participation in direct actions or confrontations that people can develop a radical consciousness. Hayden, (Jacobs and Landau, op.cit., pp.34-37) a prominent member of the American SDS suggested that if people participate in activities which confront the interests of "the elite" over concerns that immediately affect the participants, they tend to become radicalized. That is, the person discovers the connection between his condition and its roots in the structure of the political economy. He learns to make connections between "issues" or "problems" which directly affect him and the common source of his and other people's difficulties. Martin Loney, an activist at Simon Fraser University, appears to have placed credence in this idea since he ran for and won the presidency of the Canadian Union of Students in the fall of 1968 with the slogan "out of confrontation comes consciousness" (The Peak, September 11, 1968). Dotson Rader and Craig Anderson (The New Republic, May 11, 1968) also suggested that the confrontation at Columbia

---

[5] This article in the University of Saskatchewan (Regina Campus) student paper describes the local (sask.) activities of veterans of SNCC campaigns and appeals for financial support for them. (They were working with Indians and Metis).

University in May, 1968 had the effect of radicalizing students. (This report was reproduced in The Peak, May 22, 1968, p.9). Direct action was a means of discovering "the reality [which] confronts the lie of the official rhetoric" (Davidson, 1969, p.329). It was a method of educating people. It was seen as a means of overcoming the effects of living under capitalism by those who had assimilated a socialist analysis and alternative vision. By the mid 1960's American SDS members like Carl Davidson had embraced neo-Marxian ideas which were useful in making connections. Accordingly, Davidson (ibid, p.335) accepted the proposition that "'Capitalism...needs shattered and atomized men' in order to maintain its system...so as 'to perpetuate its domination over men, not only as workers, but also as consumers and citizens.'" Activities which would enable persons to connect elements, to assemble a coherent consciousness, to de-mystify the substance of social and economic relations, to de-sanctify authority, to re-distribute power, would also be a blow to the source of much of man's misery -- capitalism.

In effect, the conflict involved in confrontation could produce a transformation of consciousness: socialist analysis and class consciousness might develop out of direct experience in actions involving conflict just as class consciousness is held to be shaped by industrial conflict in orthodox Marxian analysis. Accordingly, the early American New Left's "participatory democracy contained an element which crudely approximates neo-Marxian conceptions of radicalization processes. This was the notion that ideas about, feelings for, and reactions to social phenomena are best developed out of material intercourse with society, and that ideas and principles developed in this way are most practical (applicable) when so formed. Hence, if action guides ideas and these ideas guide further action one has greater likelihood of accomplishing one's social goals. In this way of thinking, the transformation of liberal or capitalist consciousness to socialist or coherent consciousness, necessitated action qua activism. Although the "spontaneous" actions of liberals did not have such an esoteric objective, the results in some cases may have been equivalent given the availability of the ideas of persons who appeared to be able to explain what had been experienced firsthand (e.g. Marx, Mills, Marcuse, Du Bois, Fanon, Flacks, Malcolm X, Carmichael, Dillinger, Hayden, Davidson, Gorz, and so on). Actions originating in moral outrage could become informed by political ideas.

Accordingly, direct action in "civil rights" campaigns may have radicalized participants who then transformed civil rights campaigns into the Black Power Movement and the Free Speech episodes into Student Power. Similarly, Black Power and Student Power may have been fused into a movement to over-throw capitalism through an alliance with the international proletariat (the Third World) in its struggle against "the new imperialism". For whatever reason, some of the participants in the early turmoil appear to have been radicalized.

Given this progression from liberal or fragmented consciousness and discrete, or piece-meal action, to a more coherent or socialist consciousness and resistance actions directed at a whole system, some members of the American New Left began to see the world in a manner similar to leftists in other countries which had established traditions of socialist criticism. For example, variations on the Leninist (Conquest, 1972; Lenin, 1969, 1970) tradition of vanguard politics became manifest in the SDS splinter called Weatherman. Other sources of ideas besides the rather UnAmerican Americans such as Mills and Marcuse (both of whom had designated the young intelligensia as the focus of their hopes for solving the problem of agency in overthrowing the imperium of capital) were non-American like Guevara (who had written about guerilla warfare) and Gorz (who had described 'a strategy for labor') (Davidson, op.cit.). As the Cold War thawed more students gained access to ideas which enabled them to see events and conditions in unAmerican terms. For example, American adventures, such as its involvement in the domestic politics of Vietnam, Cambodia, The Dominion Republic, Cuba, Bolivia, Panama, Guatemala, Laos, and Chile could now be seen as manifestations of American imperialism or exploitation of the weak 'many' by the powerful 'few', rather than initiatives in the defense of freedom.

As Lasch (1969) said, political controversy was revived: political ideas had currency again. Pretense at non-ideological thinking would no longer be acceptable in some circles. Although much -- probably most -- of the American activism which ensued in the latter years of the decade was not informed by socialist ideas, there were students who, having become "politicized", involved themselves in a steady stream of activities, all of which were aimed at doing harm to capitalism, the common source of imperalism, war, racism, poverty, trash culture, poor education, deplorable public services and so forth. "When it turned out that the movement needed an analysis many elements of the new left embraced Marxism..." (Lasch, 1971). Of course, single-issue activism remained and through it, as we have seen, persons could become more integrated and radical (eg. see Williams, 1968, pp.163-166, 182-183); but most participants in such campaigns were probably liberals who were impatient with the pace at which "the system" made "adjustments" with respect to the specific issue in question (Buckman, op.cit., pp.103-104). Similarly, many, perhaps most, of the activists involved in episodes of educational turmoil in North America appear to have had little or no knowledge of political ideas.[6] However, even the single-issue liberal activists were affected by the sustained example of the erudite and integrated socialists whose ideas enabled them to see annoying or goading conditions ("issues") almost everywhere they looked. Even some liberals who were in the habit of looking could find liberalism's cherished freedoms denied, negated, violated or ignored almost everywhere but in the ceremonial bombast to which they were inevitably treated. And their activism could serve as a model for non-political activists.

What then, were these ideas and how were they connected? The following chapter treats this matter in the course of an examination of a series of case studies. The material for these case studies was gathered from diverse sources including student documents, especially _The Peak_ (Simon Fraser University) 1965-1970; _The Gateway_ (University of Alberta) 1963-1970; _The Carillon_ (University of Saskatchewan -- Regina) 1965-1970; and _The McGill Daily_ (McGill University) 1965-1972. As the material is described and analysed, that which the present writer sees as common characteristics of socialist consciousness and criticism is explored, and in this context the terms "leftist", "radical" and "socialist" are used interchangeably.

---

[6] These students are the subject of discussion in the chapter on mass culture and activism.

CHAPTER IV

POLITICAL IDEAS AND ACTIVISM

Socialist Analysis and Extra-parliamentary Action

Griffith (1970, p. 35) in describing the hopelessness of the electoral route and reformism as means of eliminating the persistent problematic conditions of a state and world dominated by monopoly capital, indicates an effective means of distinguishing the liberal (the reformist who believes significant change is possible through parliamentarism and electoral politics) from the radical, leftist or socialist. Griffith argues that politicians "have not the power" to effect the necessary changes since power is concentrated"...more and more...in fewer and fewer hands as the large industrial complexes extend their empires..." As a result of this process "the electorate has less and less to say (not that it ever had much) in the political decisions of government." The person who sees the futility of the electoral route as a means of attaining fundamental change is the radical, leftist or socialist.

The surge in militant radicalism, of extra-parliamentary politics, of confrontation politics, was in part a response to "the demonstrated failure of polite reformism" (Lasch, 1971, op. cit.). Some activists recognized that the system of economics operates to force a common course of conduct on the politicians and that the consensus so formed limited the electorate's choice to a narrow range of peripheral differences between essentially interchangeable "leaders" (Griffith, op. cit., p. 28 - 29) (also Charles Taylor, 1970; Williams, 1968) and "policies" (ibid, p. 26 - 27). Everyone agrees that there should be no war, poverty, homelessness, hunger, ignorance, disease, or sin. No one argues against the desirability of better education, housing, employment statistics, lower inflation rates, less drug addiction, less crime, better care of the old and infirm, higher "productivity" and "justice" for all. Radicals realize that the illusion of choice is maintained by contesting "images" who, if they debate, argue that their respective policies and priorities are most accurately reflective of what "can" be done -- "once inflation is defeated," or once the balance of payments is made "right," or once the "confidence" of the business community is assured so that an expansionary economy can pay for pollution control (or whatever is currently the fashionable "issue"). The private governments of multi-national corporations which dominate production investment and trade must be courted with "incentives" (corporate welfare) if "growth" and employment are to ensure the state's ability to pay for whatever the consensus agrees is the priority of the day. The distribution of domestic economic power and the politics of international capital proscribe the range of alternative action to the point where even the wealthier countries continue to fail "to prevent the preventable, to remedy the remediable." The most important vote is the dollar vote -- and the distribution of these is not democratic.

Those who look at the world in these terms -- those who see the mode of production as "the base" (the distribution of power) "which sets the terms...for...and proscribes the opportunities for action" (Sedgwick, op. cit., p. 40) -- are all distinguishable from the reformist who believes that the gradual accumulation of reforms will lead to the diminution of society's persistent failings (in other words, to radical change). The socialist sees the persistence of "the impressive scale of failure" rooted in the distribution of power. He sees that it is the political economy of capitalism which prevents the elimination of poverty in an affluent society, and ensures that the poor countries become poorer. Unlike the liberal, the socialist suggests that the fundamental assumptions which politicians, capitalists, senior civil servants and other decision makers share, "are far more significant than their marginal differences" (Griffith, op. cit., p. 34). Socialists regard those possessing decisive power as operatives who, by their possession of power, behave in ways to make the existing system work. They exist to maintain the essential features of the system which gratifies them (the possessors of power) through its existence and operation. Socialists, unlike liberals, see that the essential difficulty faced by reformists who place their faith in electoral processes, parliamentary reformism, and consensus politics, is that "the system itself operates to exclude" the radical change (redistribution of power) which is necessary. For, "those who exercise authority...must in their own self-interest (which liberal economies define in anti-social or at least asocial terms) prevent radical change, the purpose of which is to reduce that authority" (ibid, p. 35). The assimilation of ideas such as these leads some people to the conclusion that acceptance of, and accommodation or adjustment to a world so construed is immoral and probably suicidal; and that moral existence and perhaps even survival, entails the necessity of extra-parliamentary action.

Liberals, social democrats, Fabian socialists, and other persons, who, having been goaded by events from a disinterest in politics to participation in protest, discovered these ideas in the 1960's (Buckman, op. cit.; Lasch, 1971, op. cit.; Sedgwick, op. cit.). Some of the educational turmoil of the 1960's appears to have been one of the consequences of such developments. For there is some evidence that the behavior of some of the activists was informed by political ideas which were consistent with, derived from, or implied by, an analysis similar to that which the present writer attributes to socialists.

One of the most salient themes associated with educational turmoil has been one of changing power relationships. The concept "power," as in "student power," corresponded with the meaning of power commonly accepted by political scientists; power is "the capacity of some persons to control the conduct of others" (Shermerhorn, 1961, p. v), (also see Neuman, p. 163, in Curtis, 1962). Accordingly, educational and other institutions have been disturbed in various ways by students who were either seeking to acquire and exercise influence over others or attempting to reduce or redistribute the influence of some people over others.

While one may plausibly argue that any attempt to exercise power is a political act (Neuman, p. 164, ibid), the attempts to acquire and exercise power by some students were more informed by political ideas and analyses than similar activities of other students.

An examination of student and other newspapers, the activists' writings, "underground" periodicals, books and articles, surveys of opinion, letters, interviews, the literature on politics, economics and social criticism and other documents reveals that some activist students were in varying degrees familiar with and espoused some version of what, in general terms, might be called a "leftist" political analysis or ideology.[1] Other activists appear to have been ignorant of these ideas[2] even though they often use similar argot, slogans and symbols.

Analysis of and Reaction to the Distribution and Use of Power

As suggested above, one of the major means of identifying a leftist is his analysis of and reaction to the distribution and use of power which he observes (see footnote 1.). If power is distributed unevenly in society (i.e. social privilege exists) and those who possess more power than others use that power to exploit and oppress the less powerful, the leftist will (by definition) possess an attitude of negation toward that state of affairs. He will perceive the arrangements as being noxious and desire a termination of those arrangements.

Typically, the politically informed person recognizes that there is bound to be a close connection between the possession of economic and political power. Accordingly, if economic power or wealth is distributed very unevenly, the politically informed expect "...those who possess economic power,..(to)...identify their economic interests with the general good and...promote their interests through the mechanism of politics and

---

[1] The term "leftist" is used here in the sense used in the preceding pages of this chapter, supplemented with ideas developed by Kolakowski (1969) who defined "the left" in both abstract (conceptual) and concrete (particular) terms. In the present context the following are assumed: (1) a leftist political analysis is the analysis of a person or persons who desire to transform the existing world. It is the analysis of a movement of negation toward existing arrangements. (2) A model of the world as it should be, a utopia, is implicit in even the most inarticulate and primitive leftist analysis (e.g. that which "should be" is the absence of that which "is" (exists); and (3) that which constitutes a leftist utopia in one social context may be a description of the existing conditions against which other leftists living in those conditions move. Accordingly, a leftist in one country may be the equivalent of a member of the right (whose "essence is the affirmation of existing conditions") (_ibid_, p. 149) in another. By the same logic -- that of relation -- a rightist party member could be a leftist in that party. Because of this latter phenomenon one must define the left on the concrete and particular level. Accordingly, the present writer, following Kolakowski, assumes the presence of the following specifics helps identify a leftist: The behavior of a leftist tends to (a) abolish all social privilege, (b) terminate the oppression of colonialism or imperialism, (c) decrease limitation of freedom of speech and expression, (d) further the secularization of social life, (e) destroy racism, (f) oppose obscurantism, (g) reflect "a position of permanent revisionism toward reality."

[2] These students are discussed in the chapter on mass culture.

propaganda" (Becker, p. 178 in Curtis, op. cit.). Since this state of affairs prevails in the neocapitalist or so-called post-industrial states (Mills, 1956; Williams, 1968) as well as in the global capitalist system (Buckman, 1970; Magdoff, 1969; Minz and Cohen, 1972; Williams, op. cit.) leftists everywhere are faced with conditions, arrangements and events which are an affront to the leftists' sense of what "should be."

The fact that wealth and power under capitalism are very unevenly distributed in local institutions, as well as in the state and world, is acknowledged by non-socialists as well as socialists. However, a variety of socialist analyses[3] hold in common the notion that it is the world-wide political and economic system, variously called "free enterprise," "liberal democratic," "neo-capitalist," "monopoly or mature capitalist," "post industrial" and "imperialist," which produces and perpetuates the conditions and processes, which even some non-Socialists perceive as being problematical and unpleasant. A prodigious literature of left-socialist ideas describe the ties which a universe of unpleasant conditions have with a common source. A wholistic picture which reveals the details of the connections between noxious conditions and capitalism is described. The liberal has no equivalent or corresponding analysis. As was indicated in the first pages of this chapter, the left-socialist analyses suggest that the unpalatable results of capitalism's distribution of economic and political power and the noxious consequences of the powerful identifying and representing their own economic interests with the general good, have undermined the basis for hope in liberal reformism. Becker (*op. cit.* p. 78 - 79), Buckman (1970, ch. 2), Griffith (1970, p. 25 - 36), Magdoff (1969), Mintz and Cohen (1972) and many others have described how the operation of the neo-capitalist economy eviscerates democratic processes. Scholars such as Gorz (in Oglesby, 1969, p. 42 - 44), Mills (1956) and Williams (1968) have delineated the relationship between mass consumer culture and mature capitalism. The connections between imperialism and the operation of the economy of the liberal democratic metropolis have been discussed by many including Godfrey and Watkins (1970), Magdoff (*op. cit.*) and Williams (*op. cit.*). The logic of capitalism's systematic despoilation of the environment (Novak, 1970; Williams, *op. cit.*) and its simultaneous creation and neglect of other public needs, for example in the health area, have been carefully explored (e.g. *ibid*; Buckman, *op. cit.*; Novak, *op. cit.*). In fact, many educational complaints have been tied to the operational dynamic of capitalism (Buckman, *op. cit.*, p. 41 - 45, 82 - 85, 142; Califano, 1970, *op. cit.*; Cockburn, p. 7 - 21 in Cockburn and Blackburn, 1969; Stern, 1966; Charles Taylor, 1970, p. 60 - 65) as has the entrenchment of inequitable tax structures (Charles Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 16 - 49, 51; Toynbee, p. 95 - 102 in Blackburn and Cockburn, 1967; Williams, *op. cit.*). Similarly the widening gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" both in the imperial metropolis (e.g. the USA) and in the hinterlands (e.g. Latin America) has been attributed to the inherent power distribution of the monopoly capital system (Buckman, *op. cit.*, ch. 2; Sweezy and Huberman, *op. cit.*). These problematic conditions are then seen as inherent qualities of neo-capitalist economies. In summary, the left socialist sees the global system of mature capitalism (characterized as it is by an increasingly uneven distribution of economic power), depleting the finite resources of the metropolitan center, grasping the raw materials and markets of the hinterlands, maintaining the priority of vested interests over human needs and mystifying the fact of its doing so (Blackburn, op. cit.; Buckman, op. cit.; Gorz, op. cit.; Toynbee, op. cit.; Williams, op. cit.). As the sovereignty of smaller, less powerful states is eroded by monopoly capital (Buckman, op. cit., p. 81) the smaller, less powerful persons at home in the post-industrial state at once enjoy and endure the sweet spoils of the imperialist adventures abroad and the omni-present sourness of unfulfilled promises at home. Just as the worker finances and energizes the mechanism of his servitude, (Perlman, 1970) the less powerful states pay for and supply the entity to which they are subservient and by which they continue to be exploited. Within a world in which the powerful define the common good in terms of their own interests, all alternatives for the individual, group or state which have a bearing on the distribution of power are "managed" by the powerful (Charles Taylor, 1970; Williams, op. cit.). For the left socialist, the political options available in the liberal state are illusory. He sees advanced industrial society as a society in which "the realm of freedom has lost all its classical content, its qualitative difference from the realm of necessity" since "the technical apparatus of production and distribution has become a totalitarian political apparatus, coordinating and managing all dimensions of life" including work, leisure, wants, rewards, thought and feeling (Marcuse, 1966, p. 115).

---

[3] Not all analyses which are labelled "socialist" subscribe to the position labelled herein as socialist. Some "socialist" groups are "reformist." They accept liberal premises and definitions and are committed to the route of parliamentarism and voting. Such people are embarassed by people, associated with their party, who involve themselves in extra-parliamentary action. Accordingly, we cannot assume that they take the present analysis seriously. Thus the present writer considers them to be liberals. (For a succinct description of the varieties of socialist thought see P. Sedgwick's "Varieties of Socialist Thought" (in Crick and Robson) 1970).

For those who construe the world in these terms, the life of acquiesence is bound to be uncomfortable. One has a stark choice of withdrawing from the world in the sad hope of minimizing its noxious impact or attacking a collosal repository of power with the grandiose desire of redistributing that power, and therefore making history. Accordingly, extraparliamentary action is joined. This latter option is that with which the present writer associates some (not all) of the student activists of the past decade.

An examination of some instances of student activism reveals the basis of this association. For in some, though not all, cases there is ample evidence which indicates (1) that prominent participants in instances of turmoil possessed a leftist political analysis and (2) these activists undertook actions which were assumed to be efficacious in changing power relationships.

Radical Students and Power at Columbia University

Those students at Columbia University, who in May 1968, called for a "redistribution of power" may serve as an initial example. These students claimed that non-academic interests controlled the strategic decision-making positions at the University and that this "illegitimate power" based on property and secrecy was exercised to mystify and control students, while harnessing and training them to serve corporate greed. The weak were said to be exploited by the strong who subvert academic and community interests in order to maintain and aggrandize the power they already monopolize (NACLA, 1968). Accordingly, power (the capacity of some persons to control the conduct of others) -- had to be redistributed if the university was to serve life instead of death, peace rather than war, community interests as opposed to private greed (ibid, p. 32 - 44). Rudd, a prominent participant in the Columbia actions, emphasized that the redistribution of power which he and his cohorts sought, was based on "opposition to racism and imperialism and the capitalist system that needs to exploit and oppress human beings from Vietnam to Harlem to Columbia" (Rudd in Oglesby, 1969, p. 300). They wanted to acquire the power to terminate the university's service to business and the military (ibid, p. 301) and the arrangements which were based on the assumption that business and military interests are coextensive and compatible with student and community interests.

The Left at McGill University

Similarly, students at McGill University who participated in the turmoil at that institution from 1967 to late spring 1969 concerned themselves with changing power relationships. Stanley Gray, a McGill alumnus who had recently returned from Oxford to lecture in political science, called students to collective action. Gray wrote in the student paper the university "decisions were taken that went against student interests" and that university administrators "represent and feel themselves responsible to certain interests, primarily business ones." Furthermore "those interests are not student interests"; in fact they conflicted with student interests. Nevertheless, the business interests always prevailed because the administration was the dominant force "in the unequal power relationship." Accordingly, Gray called on the students to use collective actions such as strikes and other confrontations to "get...power"[4] (The McGill Daily[5], November 22, 1967).

---

[4] Evidence exists (e.g. Gray, 1966, a, b, c) which suggests that Gray may have been trying to create conditions which would radicalize the McGill students. The student power program and activities were, in other words, means to an end which was also a means to a revolutionary end.

[5] The McGill Daily will be referred to as The Daily hereafter.

Almost exactly one year earlier, Daniel LaTouche, one of the founders of student syndicalism in French Canada, had an article published in The Daily (November 4, 1966). In it, LaTouche described the goals and activities of the French-speaking students in relation to "la revolution tranquille." The Francophone students as a group, said LaTouche, had equipped themselves with the ideology of "le sydicalisme étudiat" and participated, "some violently, some peacefully" in building the new Quebec. This of course involved the use of power. LaTouche, in recommending this "tool" to his readers told them that "student syndicalism defines the student as a young intellectual worker and clearly states there is no such thing as student problems but only student aspects of national, societal problems."

Almost immediately after LaTouche's article appeared The Daily (November 11, 1966) printed an exposé of McGill's involvement in research "designed to aid the American war effort in Vietnam."[6] When The Daily was chastized[7] by the administration and student officials for publishing the revelations, a chapter of Students for a Democratic University (SDU), the organization which Gray was to lead the following year, was formed. SDU agitation succeeded in having the editor of The Daily reinstated. SDU began to advocate (The Daily, January 27, 1967) that McGill students join their French speaking counterparts in the syndicalist organization, L'Union Générale des Étudiants du Quebec (UGEQ), which, in taking Premier Lesage's slogan "maître chez nous" seriously, was working for a fundamental change in the distribution of power in the province. By February 9, 1967 over 2000 students at McGill, had indicated support by voting for UGEQ (The Daily, February 9, 1967) in a referendum.

---

[6] This may have been inspired by the example of Ramparts magazine (April, 1966) which printed an expose on the involvement of Michigan State University in the Vietnam war.

[7] The editor (Sandy Gage) was fired.

Meanwhile, the reinstated editor of The Daily supported a radical activist course both in editorials and featured content. For example, in an editorial (The Daily, March 3, 1967) he chided UGEQ leaders and students for being too insular, reformist and narcissistic. Gage, the editor, emphasized that students "can no longer allow...government to define the process of change" and that "a systematic program of action" was necessary; for "it is essential that the student movement show that it can extract changes from the power system..," Consistent with this editorial posture, Gage ran feature articles which described Canadian economic dependence on the USA, the political and moral consequences of that dependence, and the Canadian government's acquiescence in the erosion of Canada's independence by the greedy economic elite (The Daily, March 2, 1967, p. 5). Another article described the revolutionary response of Latin American students to American imperialism (The Daily, March 3, 1967; "The Review" supplement, p. 3). Throughout the year The Daily featured calls for activism by Canadian Union of Students (CUS) leaders (e.g. The Daily, January 26, 1967), SDU leaders (e.g. The Daily, January 27, 1967) and French Canadian students (e.g. The Daily, February 3, 1967) as well as staff writers (e.g. The Daily, March 10, 1967; "The Review" supplement, p. 3). By the time Gray's article appeared in November (1967) students had been (1) informed about what Quebec and UGEQ wanted by UGEQ's leader (Pierre LeFrancois) (The Daily, September 28, 1967, p. 5); (2) shown that English Canada had every bit as great a stake as did French Canada in a "society based on control by those who are the producers, a society in which the means of production will belong to the entire nation," a society "liberated" from the "almost total hegemony (of) the Americans" (ibid); and (3) that activism and struggle were more noble and effective than pacifismand patience -- that the "quiet revolution" was a myth (e.g. The Daily, October 13, 1967; "Flux" supplement, p. 3; October 16, 1967, p. 5).

Another set of phenomena which find their place between the publication of the LaTouche and Gray articles (i.e. between November, 1966 and November, 1967) are of interest as well. Not the least of these were the continued escalation of both the American war activity in South East Asia and protest of it. In this context, more than passing interest was shown by The Daily in a Canadian Dimension sponsored conference entitled "Canada and the American Empire" held at nearby Sir George Williams University on March 4 - 5, 1967. Besides giving promotion to the conference and presenting articles by people like Gad Horowitz (The Daily, January 20, 1967; February 16, 1967) and Mel Watkins (The Daily, March 2, 1967) who were associated with that segment of the Canadian left sponsoring the conference, The Daily ran features and columns which exposed CIA activity in Canada (February 20, 1967), discussed McGill's relation to Quebec and the "new nationalism" (February 3, 1967), and described how the USA compromised Canada's independence (March 3, 1967). Following the conference a long series of demonstrations began to focus on the Expo 67 site -- particularly the American pavilion. Participants in the peace rallies, "squat-ins," marches, picketing, and guerilla theatre, which continued all summer, called on Canada to develop a foreign policy independent of the USA and condemned American imperialism (The Daily, September 25, 1967). During that same summer the American Blacks were in revolt in cities throughout the US.

Meanwhile the ideology of "le syndicalisme étudiat" had been adopted by the French-speaking students of Quebec. In 1958, students at the University of Montreal had adopted a charter based on La Charte de Grenoble which French students (who had worked in the resistance during the German occupation) had drafted. Similar charters were adopted by other French-speaking student bodies soon after. These documents contained a rationale for students to play an active role in the creation of the future while they were still serving as intellectual workers in apprenticeship (LaTouche, op. cit., p. 120).

Originating in 19th century France's working class, "syndicalisme" expressed the necessity for workers to subordinate individual interests to those which workers shared, in order to combat a common enemy. (In France that common enemy had been defined as capitalism and the state; in the Quebec of the late '50's and early '60's it was Anglo-American imperialism -- both economic and cultural) (The Daily, September 28, 1967, p. 5). Major features (LaTouche, op. cit., p. 49) of the student syndicalist ideology included an emphatic assertion that the student or intellectual worker has the status of full citizenship and therefore has "total freedom of thought, expression and action" which means that the University must not interfere with student affairs -- especially "questions of politics, morality, thought or religion." (Exit in loco parentis, censorship and the like). Another portion stressed the importance of the conditions of work for the "intellectual worker in apprenticeship": the intellectual worker "has the right to material conditions that allow a decent life of the mind." Accordingly, the abolition of fees, the provision of a student salary, libraries, cultural centers, "a well paid staff" who have "all the necessary facilities" and academic liberty, were among the conditions which were seen to be necessary for the acquisition of "an adequate education." A third and related characteristic of the student syndicalist charter was an accentuation of the importance of intellectual work for social good. Accordingly, syndicalism emphasized the importance of social criticism, activism, and the subordination of the student's "own interests to those of society" (ibid, p. 122 - 124).

The emphasis on collective goals and action was embodied, by 1965 in l'Union Générale des Étudiants du Quebec (UGEQ) which replaced traditional student union activities with political action within the larger society. Including virtually all French-speaking students in Quebec's post-secondary institutions, its goal was to help shape a new society. In the fall of 1967 the leadership of UGEQ described a vision of this new society which was very different from Anglo-Canadian and American society. Essentially, it was a description of a socialist society which, said the UGEQ president, constituted the answer to the much asked question of what Quebec wants. Furthermore, UGEQ had a clear understanding of what stood between the realization of the new society and the present: Anglo-American capital's domination of the economy of Quebec and Canada as a whole (The Daily, September 28, 1967, p. 5). The UGEQ leadership saw little evidence that English-speaking Canadians were inclined to initiate the building of a socialist society. English-Canadians appeared to have accepted the American definition of "the good life" and seemed destined to become a junior edition of Americana. Acquiescent in being robbed and raped by the capital of the international bourgeoisie, the English-Canadians appeared incapable of shaping their own destiny. Indeed, their reluctance to control the gates to the Canadian estate appeared to make them complicit in the continuing robbery, exploitation, and attendant undernourishment of their French partners and fellow tenants. Accordingly, the UGEQ leadership and members were increasingly inclined to strike anti-federalist, anti-Anglo-American and pro-separatist postures. Their initiatives, some of which met resistance, ensured that the syndicalist-based analysis became familiar to non-students and non-French-speaking Canadians.

By November of 1967, UGEQ had broken with the Canadian Union of Students (CUS). By this time as well, the "third world" struggle had become a phenomenon with which some members of Quebec's young intelligensia associated themselves. Fanon's (Caute, 1970) analysis was widely adopted as suitable for the Quebec situation (The Daily, March 3, 1967, p. 3). The Cuban example inspired trips to that country (Stewart, 1970) and a keen interest in the legendary Guevara whose murder by American and Bolivian counter-insurgents was announced in October in the context of eulogies (The Daily, October 16, 1967). Those who now saw Quebec as a colony exploited by the new imperialism were attracted to the separatist cause. FLQ prisoners could be regarded as "political prisoners" and the persecution of Vallieres and Gagnon became a "cause célèbre." (The Daily, September 26, 1967).

Use of the Université de Montreal student paper Le Quartier Latin as a propaganda medium for separatist ideas and causes became a concern of administration officials at that institution. Administrators expressed their feelings in attempts at intimidation of the paper's staff (The Daily, January 13, 16, 17, 1967). Their repressive measures may well have exacerbated that which they saw as a problem.

Meanwhile UGEQ mounted a campaign of demonstrations and strikes in attempts to bring fruition to syndicalist goals which had not yet been fulfilled. In January (The Daily, January 25, 1967) for example, Laval students marched to abolish fees and Universite de Montreal students picketed the CPR over discriminatory treatment of Francophones.

In the autumn (1967) events of consequence began to unfold with rapidity. In September, UGEQ called a mass demonstration to demand a new French speaking university (The Daily, September 26, 1967, p. 1), sent "members to high schools" to educate high school students in syndicalism (ibid, p. 1, 3), witnessed CUS adopt syndicalism and then lose major support (The Daily, September 28, 1967), and listened to their Vietnamese guests blast American imperialism (The Daily, September 29, 1967). October brought a declaration by Linus Pauling that he was "ashamed" to be an American (The Daily, October 10, 1967), Rene Levesque's dramatic exit from the Liberals and entrance into the separatist camp (The Daily, October 17, 1967), Che's death and the successful use of direct action (an occupation) by students at Sir George Williams University in a battle over control of the bookstore (The Daily, October 26, 27, 1967).

This was the context in which The Daily (November 2, 1967) published an article of political satire, the reactions to which marked the beginning of two years of turmoil at McGill. This, plus the furor over censorship by the administration was also the context in which Gray's article calling students to "get...power" was published.

The administration, in charging two editors and a columnist of The Daily with "obscene libel" for publishing a reprint of an article which depicted the American President performing an act of necrophelia on the corpse of John Kennedy was, at least in retrospect, a monumental blunder. By acting in this manner, the administration flagrantly violated basic tenets of the syndicalist charter: the people who were threatened with expulsion were among the strongest advocates of syndicalism and UGEQ (which by now, of course, McGill had joined). Furthermore, because censorship was involved, liberals, as well as supporters of syndicalism, were outraged since a violation of a sacred liberal principle was involved. At the same time, the Principal's actions and statements with respect to the issue appeared to confirm the proposition, which had circulated for some time, that the university was more concerned with interests outside the university than with academic freedom within it. (He tried to justify his actions by suggesting that the printing of certain "opinions" were harmful to the University's image and therefore when these were printed "the authorities must take...action...to see that the University is protected") (The Daily, November 7, 1967). In addition the original American printing had not elicited prosecution in the USA. Accordingly, the administration had by its action made itself vulnerable to attack.

The attack was not long in coming. SDU, which had promoted syndicalism and led McGill into UGEQ after being founded in reaction to the firing of a previous editor of The Daily, was now headed by Stanley Gray. As a veteran worker for the leftist Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA) and an alumnus of McGill who had just returned from Oxford to lecture in political science, Gray may have seen this as an opportunity to test his theory of radicalization (Gray, 1966 a, b, c). In any case, SDU organized demonstrations and republished the contentious article along with similar material from classical literature, in a document signed by about fifty faculty members and students. SDU demanded that those signing be charged like the three Daily workers since they had committed the same offense. SDU then led about six to seven hundred students and faculty to the administration building to demand that the charges against the three be dropped.

When no response from the administration was forthcoming, about three hundred occupied the administration building (The Daily, November 6, 7, 8, 1967; February 25, 1970). After two days SDU withdrew "to carry the campaign further by different means" (The Daily, November 9, 1967) when the Senate offered to modify the procedures of its Disciplinary Committee which was to hear the case against the three Daily workers (The Daily, November 9, 1967). However, about fifty "adventurists" stayed. In withdrawing, Gray claimed that "confrontation politics does work -- we proved it." He said that the administration had made "important concessions" as a result of the sit-in tactic and that "if several hundred students and faculty can achieve this in so short a time, then 10,000 students taking collective action can make this Administration answer student demands" (ibid, p. 4).

Since the alleged concessions were more illusory than real and were represented to be more substantial than they in fact were, one may question whether in fact SDU withdrew for the stated reasons. A more plausible explanation and one consistent with Gray's (1966 a, b, c) theory is that "a large number of...students...hitherto uninvolved in political events, became sharply radicalized" (The Daily, February 25, 1970) and that was all the gain that could be hoped for.

Subsequent violent police action against a peaceful crowd, and the unsuccessful prosecution of Gray (based on alleged actions which were shown to be false by pictures published by The Daily) probably consolidated that gain. For after this affair the "extra-legal" activities of the radicals had much wider support (The Daily, February 25, 1970, p. 5).

This was the context in which Gray published his call for students to "get...power" because the administration used its power against student interests and for business interests (i.e. in The Daily, November 22, 1967). The university officials appeared to have been more concerned with the "image" of the university than with the exploration of ideas; they appeared to be prepared to sacrifice academic freedom for more endowment funds; and they appeared to condone war research while denying freedom of expression in the name of morality. This was the context out of which a "Socialist Action Committee" was created and these were the conditions which enabled radicals to capture control of the student union and retain the student paper as a forum for the dissemination of ideas and information which served their purposes.

From this point forward to the spring of 1968 the leftists explored and publicized the relationship McGill had with the international corporate power structure and the effects of these connections on the role and operation of the university, while at the same time consolidating old and making new connections with elements in French speaking Quebec (The Daily, February 25, 1970). For example, The Daily published articles which described how "third world problems (are) linked with imperialism" (December 22, 1967) and how "research...vital to imperialism" is financed and carried out in the universities (January 17, 1968).[8] Similarly, The Daily published an article which purported to show how the university was compromised by its allowance of on-campus recruitment by industrial firms (January 29, 1968), and in its next issue quoted university officials (on page one) as stating that "unrestricted recruiting" was "university policy"

---

[8] This article argued that "the academic world...has been reconstructed to aid in the administration of the new empire" and that the modern universities constitute "the nucleus of the research apparatus of US imperialism" (The Daily, January 17, 1968, p. 7).

(January 30, 1969). In the same vein, an article entitled "Capitalism leads to genocide" (February 1, 1968) was followed by articles which documented Canadian business connections (called "The War Merchants") with the war in Vietnam (February 7, 1968) and linked members of the Board of Governors to "war production" businesses (February 8, 9, 1969). At the same time, another essay which appeared, declared:

> the business of the university is to serve business. It is controlled by businessmen and the profit from its operations accrue to businessmen; it is financed by the entire society.

Further on, the same author says:

> Corporations...suck profits like blood in every corner of the United States and to (sic) the farthest frontiers of its foreign domains; economic leaders...arrange for profitable savagery in Vietnam, in Africa, in South America; ever more clever techniques may be elaborated to draw profits from the public treasury -- yet liberals will continue to view these men sitting on boards of governors as philanthropists and benefactors. (The Daily, February 9, 1968, "Flux" supplement, p. 2).

These fine words were followed by an article which described student syndicalism, its past accomplishments, its present goals, the problematic social conditions which it must face, and the solution to these problems: "mass action" (January 15, 1968).

The university and its corporate connections were attacked in an unrelenting manner through the pages of The Daily. This editorial policy was carried through to the end of the spring (1968) term. In one of The Daily's last (March 15, 1968) issues of that year, its ally, Stan Gray, capped its performance with an essay entitled "Administration: an unconstructive monority." In this piece Gray gave a summary description of the sins, weaknesses and blunders of the administration, while throwing administrators' words back in their faces. A taste of the substance and flavor of his criticism can be appreciated in the following paragraph:

> It is apparent that Administration only uses the rhetoric of academic rights and freedoms as ex post facto legitimations of decisions taken on the basis of other considerations. Not only have they given contradictory definitions of academic freedoms and rights, but their conception of these freedoms involves unlimited rights for outside corporations and Administrative officials but severely restricted rights for campus publications and students at disciplinary hearings. (The Daily, March 15, 1968, p. 5)

Meanwhile, the UGEQ used direct action tactics in pursuit of its syndicalist program. Unlike schools in other regions of the continent, a policy of solidarity -- of united and concerted action -- tended to be followed. For example, when the French language junior colleges (CEGEP's) had difficulty in having their program recognized for transfer credit at the universities (February, 1968), and when the students of the CEGEP's took action to stimulate the creation of university expansion to take care of their future needs (September, 1967), students from other UGEQ member schools turned out to demonstrate in their support. Similarly, in pursuit of syndicalist objectives, students from all over the province converged on Quebec City from time to time, to demonstrate for the abolition of fees and the improvement of other financial arrangements for students (e.g. January, 1968, see The Daily, January 18, 1968). The sharing of a coherent ideology and program, which emphasized the necessity of disciplined collective action; the subordination of individual interests to those of the collective; the insistence on the proposition that there are no student problems -- only student aspects of societal problems; the emphasis on making connections, made the Quebec student movement unique in terms of size, direction, scope and discipline.

Not surprisingly, student syndicalists and their faculty supporters made connections or alliances outside of the academies as well, in their pursuit of their syndicalist goals. The syndicalist analysis emphasized the fact that fundamental changes in the educational institutions depends upon changes in the society which hosts the institutes. Accordingly, the support of groups outside the academies had to be cultivated and common cause had to be made with them to change the social conditions, if the schools were to be changed (because the problems of the student reflect the problems of the larger society).[9] As a consequence, for those who defined "the good of society" in terms of socialism and independence, connections were made with independence groups who had socialist programs or goals. Indeed, those whose actions were guided by the syndicalist ideas would tend to subordinate their activism in the academic milieu to the larger social goals (LaTouche, op. cit.) (also The Daily, February 22, 1968, p. 1).

Among the various independentist groups which abounded (and which shared members in common) (Stewart, 1970, p. 44) was Le Front de Liberation Populaire (FLP). One of the leaders of the FLP was Stan Gray who through this and other associations developed a network or coalition of student and off-campus groups (Sheffe, 1970, p. 17). The ultimate goal of the FLP was socialist revolution and independence for Quebec

---

[9] UGEQ President Pierre LeFrancois, for example, is reported by The Daily (February 22, 1968, p. 1) to have said, when calling for a referendum on the status (independence) of Quebec, that "it is almost impossible to discuss education without referring to the status of Quebec."

(Gray, 1970; Stewart, op. cit., p. 41). In order to generate the power which was necessary to effect the ultimate redistribution of power implied by this goal, the FLP helped organize various "actions" and lent its support to actions initiated by others in the months following its formation in March, 1968.

There were plenty of opportunities to join in common cause with groups who had complaints. Quebec, after Expo, had a severe recession and unemployment was high. With few university places available, with the problem of acquiring transfer credit for the junior college programs and with few jobs available, the CEGEP's students were very disgruntled. Other groups in the slums and other "under-privileged" areas had formed citizen and worker committees with the help of the Company of Young Canadians (CYC) workers and les Travailleurs Étudiants du Quebec. They aimed at acquiring "worker power." The Ligue pour l'Integration Scolaire (LIS), a group which desired French unilingualism was also ready to move -- as was the FLQ. Gray and the FLP were prepared to assist the various discontented groups who would, through contact, be subjects for radicalization and potential allies in the larger struggle to come.

Accordingly, CYC and FLP worked side by side in community organizing. Similarly, the taxi drivers who struck back at the Murray Hill Limousine Service monopoly were assisted by the FLP. In addition, the St. Leonard French-unilingual campaign was supported heavily by the FLP. Nor did the FLP ignore the CEGEP students. With the clouds of discontent so seeded, the storm which lasted through June the following year arrived in September, 1968 when the CEGEP students went out on strike, occupied the schools and marched in the streets.

Meanwhile as the socialists like Gray and Fekete (the columnist who had been charged with "obscene libel"), were concentrating their efforts through the Socialist Action Committee (SAC, formerly SDU) and work with the non-McGill groups discussed above, a group of political science students, who appear to have been more liberal than socialist, formed an association (PSA) which demanded "educational reforms" and student representation on decision-making bodies within the department. When faculty rejected some of their proposals, PSA voted to strike and occupied the department premises. A compromise proposal ended the action. While these students were dealing in terms of power, their ideas for its use appear to have been quite limited (The Daily, February 25, 1970).

The only other disruption on the McGill campus was that of an Arts and Science Faculty Council meeting by a group which demanded "open decision-making." This was a matter of little consequence. However, it kept the campus expectant.

Perhaps what came was more than expected. At the beginning of the second term (January, 1969) a new group formed by SAC began a campaign the likes of which no university in Canada had or has seen since. The Radical Student Alliance (RAS) was clearly a socialist revolutionary group which had as its goal, the independence of a socialist Quebec. Led by Gray and Fekete, it formulated a list of demands in the form of a manifesto which called for, among other things, the increased use of the French language and the abolition of plans for a new Faculty of Management building. With control of The Daily, Student Council and the student seats in the Senate, RSA pressed the University officials to face such matters as McGill's role in Quebec (The Daily, February 25, 1970): How could McGill justify being financed by the Quebecois when its business was conducted in English and the interests it appeared to serve were the most blatant exploiters of the Quebecois? How could McGill in the Quebec of the '60's justify its lack of service to the French community? Given the shortage of places in the universities for the French speaking majority (demonstrated by the present plight of the thousands of CEGEP graduates), why should McGill remain an instrument for, and a bastion of, the privileged English speaking minority? Why shouldn't McGill recognize "the French fact" and serve those who finance its operation? Why shouldn't McGill become a French university? Didn't the slogan "maitre chez nous" imply what the future of McGill must be? Questions such as these were raised.

The radicals described McGill as an undemocratic, reactionary institution "controlled by and servicing the giant Anglo-American corporations responsible for the economic exploitation and cultural oppression of the (French Canadian) majority" (Scheffe, op. cit., p. 17). In terms of this analysis, McGill embodied, in microcosm, the forces which created the various conditions which annoyed the CEGEP's students, the taxi drivers, the Mouvement pour l'Integration Scolaire (MIS) (the Ligue pour l'Integration Scolaire (LIS)) and other working class groups, including the Montreal Labor Council (CNTU) and the CYC-organized "citizens groups." As such, it could be used as a focus for education, for radicalization through action, for forging an instrument of power.

Accordingly, "Operation McGill" was conceived and carried out in two theatres of struggle by an alliance of English-speaking socialist radicals and French-speaking separatists who embraced various versions of socialism. Inside the University (one of the theatres) the radicals made their demands, and, in the absence of administrative accommodation to them, used disruptive tactics to force the University to deal with "the issues" and polarize the members of the University. With The Daily as a propaganda vehicle and the Senate seats as instruments for injecting the "issues" into the governing bodies, the RSA pushed for immediate consideration of its programme. As enunciated by one of the radical student senators (who was also a member of the radical Student Council Executive) the programme included: creation of a "Faculty of Labour;" a Center to study and support "Third World liberation movement" (sic); abolition of the "tokenist" French Canada Studies Programme; creation of a "functional French Programme" so that by 1972 "all Candidates for degrees and all teaching personnel will be able to speak the language of Quebec;" 24-hour library service which is accessible to the public; acquisition of more books in the French language; further "democratization" of the University's governing bodies including the election of senior administrators and the restructuring of the Senate so that students, staff (including both academic and non-academic) and the Quebec people (particularly the working class) would each have "one-third representation" (ibid, p. 22 - 23). Outside the University proper, a propaganda campaign involving posters and 100,000 copies of a special French-language edition of The Daily supplemented the organizational efforts of Gray's RSA and FLP, the members of which may have seen themselves as a vanguard executing a strategy designed to lead to a popular insurrection.*

While action by Gray's coalition of off-campus groups was being planned, the Senate, McGill's main governing body, was paralyzed by the persistence of the radicals and the adamant posture of the other senators with respect to discussion of the questions placed before them by the students. This, on top of the eleven-day political science occupation and disruptions of Board of Governors, Senate, and other University groups' meetings, served as the basis for having procedures for Gray's

---

*Stewart (*op. cit.*, p. 30) claims that copies of a document entitled *Revolutionary Strategy and the Role of the Avant-Garde* were in possession of "many" of the various groups which made up the coalition which Gray and his group organized for the sponsorship of Operation McGill. The following excerpts (from those portions of the document quoted in Stewart, p. 30) along with reports (e.g. *The Daily*, February 25, 1970, p. 5) which describe how the leadership of RSA operated, give plausibility to the hypothesis that Gray and the other RSA and FLP leaders saw themselves as a disciplined vanguard with a specific function.

> "'Inevitably, Quebec revolutionaries will come to group themselves in a single movement (...)
>
> That they fight today in the FLP, the FLQ, the citizen's committees, the MLT, the MIS, the Vallieres-Gagnon committee, and the unions, makes little difference. They all participate in the same strategy...
>
> The strategic objective is clear to all: the destruction of the capitalist society and the construction of an egalitarian, just and free society founded on the practice of collective self-determination (...)
>
> Here in Quebec the fight for the destruction of the capitalist system is inseparable from the struggle for national independence...
>
> Since 1963...we find ourselves in this first step of the revolutionary struggle and will progress as far as generalized agitation culminating in a crisis. (...)
>
> The first step (...) is essentially political. (...) bombings (...) demonstrations (...) strikes (...) occupations, are not part of a military action. The military stage will come later, when the masses are ready to arise...
>
> The role of political organizations like the FLP and the FLQ is not to replace the unions and citizens' committees but to furnish them with the political and ideological weapons they need, not only to confront the bourgeois system, but above all to destroy it.
>
> The organization of the exploited must lead directly to a popular insurrection (...)'"
>
> (Stewart, 1970, p. 30; The brackets indicate omissions by the present writer.)

dismissal brought against him the same day (February 11, 1969) that The Sir George Williams turmoil reached its climax with a fire just a few blocks from McGill.

When, on March 28, 1969, Gray marched in the front row of 10,000 demonstrators shouting "McGill Francais" more than a little "hostility" (*The Daily*, February 25, 1970) greeted him and his coalition of supporters, along with "the cops" (*The Daily*, September 17, 1969). The Sir George Williams University affair apparently produced an increase in hostility to campus disturbance. Perhaps the bombs which had been exploding (and continued to explode)in the area around McGill's campus added to the feelings of the reception (Stewart, *op. cit.*, p. 45). This hostility was decisive. For the coalition of demonstrators marshalled by the RSA, FLP, MIS (LIS), Taxi Liberation Committee, Montreal Labor Council (CNTU), the CÉGEP's Mouvement Syndical-Politique (MSP), teachers' union, and Université de Montreal students, abandoned McGill as "'innately' reactionary (*The Daily*, February 25, 1970, p. 5) and "not worth saving from the clutches of the Right" (*ibid*, March, circa 16, 1970). *The Daily's* (February 25, 1970) statement that "the radical movement at McGill collapsed" on March 28, 1969, described the situation nicely: as of May, 1972, only a small handful of isolated and ineffectual Maoists and a few muckraking journalists give visibility to the Left at McGill.

Perhaps McGill's radicals, if there are any, have learned like many of their French-speaking counterparts, that the struggle against Anglo-Canadian colonialism and American imperialism is more effectively fought on other fronts and with different instruments (Gray, 1970, p. 100). They may have discovered that

> It is essential that radical student movements...

> extend their sphere of activities beyond the confines of the university and make a common political front with the trade union movement (and others) for the university can never be basically changed until the society as a whole is democratized (Gray, 1969, p. 56).

However, the massive repression which was highly visible and brutal in late June 1969, again in the fall (especially in October) 1969, and in 1970 may have had an inhibiting effect of greater significance in producing the present situation, than a changed tactic on the part of the leftists. Gray, for example, after being released from jail following the "October crisis," (1970) has retired to Ontario and his fellow RAS leaders are quietly working in conventional roles.[10] At present, nobody at McGill is calling on students to "get...power."

In spite of this, no other English language campus in North America appears to have hosted turmoil produced by activists who were so successful in marshalling off-campus support. If one can assume that the measure of a successful and radical student activism is the extent to which it merges with that of non-students in a movement which is more powerful and therefore more capable of producing a redistribution of power in the body politic, the McGill radicals were probably the most successful activists in English-speaking North America. Perhaps the historically given milieu in which they operated was a comparatively more fertile terrain for the growth of the "outside" support which the SDU -- SAC -- RSA received, than that which surrounds other campuses in English speaking North America. However, some credit for the comparatively larger off-campus support received by the McGill radicals must be given to the organizational skills, the ideological sophistication, the hard work, and the strategical acumen (to say nothing of the oratorical prowess) of the McGill leadership. In addition, the nature of the ideas with which the activists cast their experience or perceptions and made their analyses and plans, must also be contrasted with the ideas used at other schools. The emphasis on subordinating individual interests to those of the collective; the insistence on the proposition that student problems were only aspects of larger social conditions; the stress on making connections in thought and action; the refusal to substitute short-term and local gains for the ultimate objectives; the relatively concrete program and the clarity with which its implementation was related to the use of power, manipulation, or influence; the understanding that individual well-being is dependent on social well-being; the emphasis on the importance of criticism and intellectual rigor; all of these suggest a coherent set of ideas whose inherent characteristics militate against the fragmentation of consciousness, the anarchic behavior, and the abstract and incoherent idealism of liberal man. The leadership of McGill's activists had no illusions about the power that comes with sharing a chamber with others whose power, like all power in the universities, is delegated by, and exists at the pleasure of the kings of the economy and their political servants. For them, campaigns to "get...power" were exercises in education; they were engineered experiences whose purpose was political education. Involvement in collective, direct action was a means through which people could discover that "the idea of society as a neutral area within which each individual is free to pursue his own development and his own advantage" (Williams in Curtis, op. cit., p. 155) is an illusion and a lie; that individualism, the bourgeois creed, is brutal and inhumane and deprives men living under the practice of that doctrine, of those conditions (such as equality of condition) which are the exclusive product of collective enterprise. The radical leaders do not appear to have convinced themselves (as did many North American students) that the university is indispensable to the bourgeoisie, that academics were more important in bourgeois society than they really are. Accordingly, they did not, like so many other North American activists, focus their efforts so exclusively on campus. They knew that Noranda Mines, Power Corporation, General Motors, Household Finance, and the other "grand masters of consumption" were far more important than McGill for anyone undertaking an analysis of the distribution of power with its ultimate redistribution in view. Gray, Fekete, Foster, Hajaly, and other radicals knew that student parity on governing bodies in a university does not in any sense threaten that which the Montreal Stock Exchange and Westmount represent. Like their fellow syndicalists from the French speaking schools, they knew that student control of the universities does not mean American domination of culture and economy is threatened, or that exploitative practices are thereby diminished. They had not been convinced that the quality, youth, is coextensive with wisdom and virtue. Accordingly, the replacement of bourgeois businessmen and liberal professors with inexperienced bourgeois students and working class people whose "habits of mind" are like those of the rulers, was a tactical demand more than an end in itself. For as LaTouche, a founder of les Canadien's student syndicalist movement, wrote (The Daily, November 4, 1966)

---

[10] Tom Sorell (Editor of The Daily, 1972). Personal communication.

> ...putting a student on the board doesn't change it a single iota...Putting a majority of students and faculty on the board...will not change a thing, for the simple reason that its not because you are a student and even less because you're a professor that you're able to administrate a university. Students and professors put in the place of actual

> governors will tend in the long run to act the same way that the actual governors do. Look at how student administrations are run.[11] ...student structures are the most reactionary, well established and pro-status-quo structures you can think of...We had to try something different...Our solution was to organize...a centralized movement...Leaders are training...students to be socially animated...The main emphasis...(is)...political pressure. (However) ...there is no such thing as student problems but only student aspects of national societal problems.

Apparently, the syndicalists and Marxists both understood that the fate of a strictly student movement is sealed by the same sort of process that diffuses workers' struggles: economism or co-optation (The Carillon, October 18, 1968).

In McGill, as at many other schools, matters such as the principle of *in loco parentis*, secrecy, business recruiting, war, racism, administration blunders, and censorship have produced turmoil from time to time. However, what was particularly unique about McGill between November 1966 and April 1969, was the progressive increase in the radicals' ability to sustain turmoil through connecting on-campus conditions, arrangements and events with off-campus conditions, arrangements and events and their consequent ability to marshall off-campus support to the point where, what began as a single issue ended as a general campaign involving both on and off campus groups.

The English-speaking Student Left Outside of Quebec

At no time did the activists at other campuses in English Canada accomplish this. With a few fitful exceptions at Saskatchewan (Regina Campus), Simon Fraser and Alberta, English-speaking radicals appeared to concentrate on the campus and neglect the outside. This was the reverse of the syndicalist approach found in Quebec where there was a continuing effort to move out to the larger society. At Regina, the radicals attempted to gain off-campus support only after (that is, in reaction to) the administration and provincial government's blatant and repressive attempts to intimidate them in early 1969 (The Carillon, January 8, 13, 1969; February 7, 1969). A small "groupuscule" of SDU people led by McGill alumnus Jon Bordo, made some gestures in community work in the last years of the '60's in Edmonton; but no obvious effects became manifest. Similarly, the much talked about off-campus work (with unions, Chinese-Canadians, Indians and Metis, tenants, youth and women) (Briemberg, 1970, p. 43, 53) of activists in Simon Fraser's Politics, Sociology, and Anthropology Department (PSA) produced nothing so noticeable as a loud silence from the groups listed, when the "PSA struggle" was underway (1969-1970) (Aberle, 1970). The lack of support for radicals from these groups may have been based on a number of variables. However, little effort had in fact been expended in working with youth, women, natives, unions, tenants, and Chinese-Canadians (Briemberg, op. cit., p. 53). The hostility of the mass media which Simon Fraser activists faced was also a factor common to the McGill radicals who faced a press no less hostile. Notwithstanding the differences in milieux which lends plausibility to the hypothesis that off-campus support was more easily recruited in Quebec than in the West, some of the discernable differences in the activism of the two regions may be instructive. For not only did the host milieux and community support for the activists differ between the two regions; the ideologies, goals, strategies and persistence of the activists in the two regions differed. Accordingly, an examination of some of the political activism and turmoil which was manifested at the University of Saskatchewan (Regina campus), Simon Fraser University and the University of Alberta follows.

---

[11] Apparently LaTouche did not feel it was necessary to underscore the obvious with respect to faculty meetings and committees.

Any attempt to comprehend the turmoil which resulted from the activism of "politicized" students in English-speaking Canada necessitates a familiarity with two important factors: the first of these is the influence of developments within the institutionalized left on the Canadian "New Left." The second is the increasing domination of English Canadian culture by the Americans and the impact of that domination on the left.

Part of the foundation of Canada's new left was the tradition represented by the "social democracy" of the Canadian Commonwealth Federation (CCF) and the socialist ideologies of smaller leftist groups. The carriers of this tradition were active not only in electoral politics: many were prominent in various "peace" organizations which remained viable during the late 1940's and the early '50's.[12] With historical precedents to draw upon, such as the pacifists who were given protection under the Militia Act of 1808, the League for Peace and Democracy of the 1930's and the work of James Endicott, an organization called the Peace Congress was formed in 1947 (Moffat, op. cit.) with branches in various parts of the country. This group advocated an end to the arms race, claimed that war with the USSR was not inevitable and harbored the suspicion that what they called the "US military-industrial power complex" was committed to over-throwing the government of the USSR (ibid, p. 168). Speaking tours were arranged (e.g. in 1948) (at which Endicott and Hewett Johnson, "The Red Dean of

---

[12] The present account is based primarily on Laxer (op. cit.); McGuigan (1968); Moffat (op. cit.); and Roussopoulos (1970).

Canterbury," were not always allowed to speak due to violent hostility). American involvement in Canada was attacked and petitions for the abolition of nuclear weapons were circulated (500,000 names on a petition were taken to the Second World Peace Congress held in Stockholm in 1950). After Canadians had protested "the bomb" in a rally at Winnipeg in 1951, the McCarthy witch hunts in the USA apparently produced enough of a "spill-over" intimidation that "peaceniks" maintained a discrete posture until Suez and Hungary of 1956 broke the silence. Shortly thereafter (1958) a new organization, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), absorbed much of the Peace Council's efforts. Meanwhile, prominent Canadians like *Maclean's* editor, Ralph Allen, were shocked by the discovery of the degree of sovereignty the Americans had assumed over Canada through such devices as the Distant Early Warning (DEW) Line agreement (*ibid*). Criticism of the DEW Line, suggestions that Canada had become an American satellite (*ibid*, p. 81) and publicity over nuclear fallout led to the formation of the CND which included a "Direct Action Committee" based on the British example. A year later, in 1959, the Combined Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CUCND) appeared at McGill, Sir George Williams and the Université de Montreal and quickly spread to other campuses. A march on Ottawa, Christmas Day, 1959, protested the installation of Bomarc missiles in Canada. A brief backed up by 120,000 signatures which was presented to parliament, noted contradictions in public policies and suggested that only lip service had been paid to certain values (Roussopoulos, 1970, p. 9). Accordingly, a tradition of extra-parliamentary action was living through the Canadian "Peace Movement" at the beginning of the 1960's. However, its vibrancy was not, as seen above, entirely independent of the growing American influence on Canada.

The establishment of television service in Canada during the 1950's exacerbated the problem of American "cultural imperialism" which accompanied American capital's accelerating economic take-over (Lumsden, 1970). Accordingly, television at once carried images of a rejuvenated America, communicated the image-maker's new hopes connected with the election of the glamorized Kennedy with his "New Frontier" ethos, and acquainted viewers with the American students journey to the South and the resultant conflict over black-voter registration. Perhaps the appearance of a new idealism, vitality and immanent progress prepared Canadians to attach themselves even more actively to "things American."

Fascination with this apparently rejuvenated giant was apparent in the mass media whose reports were supplemented by the ideas and reports of an increasing number of American professors, magazines, books, television programs and visitors which were to be found in Canada. Accordingly, Canadian students became familiar with Students Non-violent Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Knowledge of the activities of SNCC and SDS was reflected in the transformation of the CUCND in 1964. This was an auspicious occasion for what Caplan and Laxer (op. cit.) called the "Americanization of the Canadian Student Movement" (see Lumsden, 1970).

The immediate stimulus which produced the transformation of the CUCND was the acquisition by Canada of the nuclear Bomarc missiles in 1963. The events leading to that acquisition convinced some members in CUCND that social change was the only route to peace (Laxer, op. cit., in Lumsden, p. 276). Accordingly, a new organization, Students Union for Peace Action (SUPA) was created in 1964 and its character was remarkably American for a Canadian left (see Caplan and Laxer, op. cit.).

American examples were uncritically adopted and copied. The American liberal's illusion, his naive dream (Lasch, 1971, op. cit.) about the nature of direct or primary democracy was seen by SDS to be both a means and an end (i.e. it's goal). This, and the anti-ideological substitution of appeals to love and brotherhood for a working-analysis based on a coherent ideology, resulted in the adoption by the early SDS of what was called "participatory democracy" (PD). The "mystique of participation," a "therapeutic technique," was substituted for organization, leadership, ideas and program, on the incredible but implicit assumptions that "competence is equally distributed among people of good intentions" (Lasch, 1971, op. cit.), that "discipline is inherently 'alienating'" (ibid) and that one can and should eliminate bureaucracy (Jacobs and Landau, op. cit.) in an industrialized world. As we saw in Chapter Three, this was tantamount to the idealization of the liberal state and the use of a "technique" to rectify what was considered to be its debasement. When SUPA began to imitate SDS it was, in effect, ignoring its heritage from the Canadian left. One is therefore forced to ask why?

American cultural penetration was, as is suggested above, probably a major factor in influencing SUPA's character. Moffat (op. cit., p. 153) has argued that another factor had to do with developments in the Canadian party of the left: since the CCF was transformed into the NDP it had abandoned its anti-NATO position. Some people in the "peace movement" were shocked by this and suggested that this move was an attempt to get Canadian Labor Congress funds. Young members of CUCND apparently interpreted this to mean that no true reform was possible within the existing political system, since the NDP policy-shift appeared to mean, that in order to gain political power, the new party had to make so many compromises that it would, in the end, be indistinguishable from the other parties. The example of Wilson's Labour Party in Britain was a handy illustration to cite in making the point. In addition to this development some saw the NDP casting off its former CCF radicalism and aiming at merely "improving the material circumstances of some Canadians rather than teaching them to lead basically different lives" (ibid, p. 153). A heritage seemingly discredited was therefore ignored, and ignorance of a heritage far more thoroughly discredited, led to the adoption of liberal tools to do a socialist's job.

The extent to which members of SUPA, like their SDS models, believed that they could transform a given situation into something else, while at the same time repudiating "manipulation" -- all manipulation per se -- is an indication of the extent to which their consciousness was fragmented and confused by the permeation of liberal ideology. Fortunately, their contradictory behavior -- that of direct action and education -- saved them from complete paralysis. Nevertheless, the American liberal ideas and forms which were adopted seriously hampered SUPA's effectiveness in implementing an agenda which, if pursued with a revitalized party of the left, leadership, analysis and organization, would have been more capable of bringing "power to the people" than the confused, aimless, unco-ordinated and ultimately unsuccessful SUPA[13] (Laxer, 1970, op. cit., p. 283).

This, then was the state of English Canada's "new left" in 1964; for SUPA was its New Left at that time. Since members of SUPA were to be found on many campuses in the west (even though its major base was in the Toronto-Ottawa-Montreal area) the activism of SUPA people was usually at the core of the turmoil.

---

[13] When SUPA died in 1967 its members admitted that this was the problem. (McGuigan, 1968, p. 106 - 108).

The Student Left at the University of Saskatchewan (Regina Campus)

At Regina, two of the SUPA group, who were to be involved in turmoil at Simon Fraser a few years later, helped make the first news of turmoil at the University of Saskatchewan during the mid-sixties. John Conway, who was editor of the student paper in the autumn of 1965, and got fired that same term, (The Carillon, October 22, 1965) made extensive (his enemies claimed almost exclusive) use of SUPA literature (e.g. The Carillon, September 20, p. 4; September 24, p. 2, 1965), and made SUPA's concerns The Carillon's concerns (e.g. Vietnam, ibid, p. 4). He told students (September 20, 1965, p. 2) that in the university "primary power ...resides with men with limited vision, organizational goals and an efficiency orientation," that the faculty had "defaulted," that students acting in unity "possess incredible power" and that students should "mutilate" their IBM cards and democratize the university (ibid, p. 4). Jim Harding, the other SUPA man who was to make news as a central figure in turmoil both at Regina and Simon Fraser, also worked as a reporter for The Carillon under Conway's editorship. Pat Uhl, an American radical who attended the Regina campus and spoke on behalf of SNCC veterans working with Saskatchewan Indians in SUPA projects, also wrote columns calling for radicalism in Conway's Carillon (e.g. October 8, 1965, p. 7).

While the writings of Conway and Harding reflected traces of socialist analysis, they appeared to have been influenced to a considerable extent by liberal articles of faith. For example, the importance of education and educational institutions as a process and mechanism of fundamental social transformation was wildly exaggerated. Thus Conway included the following astonishing statement in The Carillon (October 15, 1965, p. 9): "...The development of undergraduate education is today our most pressing social problem." Similarly, Harding apparently believed, as some Americans did, that the universities are so vital to corporate capitalism that if they are paralyzed, or if business is deprived of their present types of students and research, corporate capitalism will be crushed. He wrote:

> Our struggle...must be based in the universities. Control over the education that affects us is no small issue...Corporate capitalism and imperialism will indeed suffer a blow if we can take charge of our education...
>
> Present universities are an appendage to the market place. We cannot accept such institutions... (The Carillon, October 18, 1968, p. 6 - 7).

Although Conway was fired (October 22, 1965, p. 1), The Carillon continued to follow the same basic editorial policy Conway established, (but with more prudence) and Conway and the other activists continued to contribute to, and dominate the paper. However, the new editor included more articles on the American version of justice (e.g. The Carillon, December 10, 1965, p. 2), American imperialism (The Carillon, November 26, 1965, p. 2; January 28, 1966, p. 2), and business affairs such as the CPR's scandalous behavior (The Carillon, January 28, 1966, p. 4). In addition, the non-renewal of Harding's contract as an instructor was given ample space as alleged violation of his academic freedom developed into an issue which was an occasion for minor turmoil (The Carillon, January 14, 1966, p. 1, 2; March 11, 1966, p. 1, 2).

Activists maintained control of the paper the following year. An article based on Jagan's analysis of American imperialism in Latin America was featured on the front page of the first issue (The Carillon, September 12, 1966). The article ended with some very pointed questions, based on extrapolations from Jagan's analysis, about Canada's economy. However, the cant of liberal ideology still abounded. For example the associate editor wrote about "manipulation," "participatory democracy" and the ways in which the "bureaucracy" in its "monolithic and manipulative structure" (all bad words!) "stifles" (another one) "the creative talent of the student who approaches it with his facility for mental growth unimpaired" (The Carillon, September 12, 1966, p. 2). This popular form of educational criticism was published along with reports on student activism in Venezuela (The Carillon, October 7, 1966, p. 2), Berkeley (The Carillon, October 14, 1966, p. 2), Quebec, (ibid, p. 4), Argentina, Columbia, Mexico, Cuba, Peru and the Dominican Republic (ibid, p. 5), and Montreal (ibid, p. 6). The article on Berkeley suggested that "mass" and "direct action" seems to be the "answer" to student problems among which were listed the "knowledge factory" and faculty who "haven't the guts" to do anything about the system. "Struggle in Venezuela" described American economic exploitation and the guerilla response; and the article on student activism in the other Latin American countries described how students allegedly toppled dictatorships and brought freedom to the people through agitation. Meanwhile, Conway bitterly attacked the faculty as "a greater threat to academic freedom than the institutions of government, business, the military, or religion and their combined pressures" (The Carillon, September 23, 1966, p. 4); described the military research at Michigan State University and the University of Pennsylvania and concluded with the unqualified generalization that "the university is becoming the fortress of paramilitarists, the bastion of totalitarianism and the home of monsters in human raiments" (The Carillon, October 7, 1966, p. 4)!

The first sign of the turmoil which was to become manifest sporadically over the period from January 1967 to April 1969, appeared in an editorial which attacked the then Premier for "buying votes," being stingy in the financing of education and other public services, (in order to be able to dole out corporate welfare "to that pulp mill,") and keeping higher education out of the reach of poor, but able, people (The Carillon, October 28, 1966, p. 2). Student Council, which included former Carillon editors Conway and his successor Mitchell, began, at the same time, to attack the provincial government (ibid, p. 3). In December, about 400 students marched to the administration to present a list of grievances, none of which were defined very clearly. However, by the end of January, 1967, the demand for an end to "secret" meetings and a call for "open" decision-making was made and explained by the Student Council's president. He gave an indication of why this was done in a press release: "There is a growing conern...that decisions made by the Board of Governors may not be made with academic consequences in mind" (The Carillon, January 27, 1967, p. 1). When the Principal reacted angrily to this suggestion, The Carillon editor suggested that a student sit-in at the Board of Governors' meeting "might be a good way of teaching our employees who really is boss" (The Carillon, February 3, 1967, p. 2).

At this point there was little evidence of any radical or other sort of political content in the turmoil, and Conway in his column "University of the Absurd," expressed his contempt for the whole business (ibid, p. 3). Conway apparently regarded the students as counterfeit activists looking for a cause and not having the erudition or acumen to see that they were surrounded by them. As one of his fellow columnists wrote, the students "lash out in all directions searching for a concrete enemy" but they don't seem to know "what exactly the problem is" (The

Carillon, March 13, 1967, p. 2).

Given this situation, Conway wrote a long letter to the editor of The Carillon in which he described what he conceived to be the numerous deficiencies of the University. In doing so, he attacked the Premier for interference in campus affairs, and his "penny-pinching anti-intellectualism;" he attacked the administration and faculty for certain decisions taken and others which were not taken; and he suggested that the quality of intellectual intercourse on campus was "insipid." This broadside brought a hail of wrath down on Conway's head and a protest to The Carillon from the Principal, who claimed that an editorial policy which permitted the printing of such material was wrong (The Carillon, March 28, 1967). However, it did not give life to the fitful, and essentially directionless, activism, that had erupted from time to time.

The radicals appeared to be isolated from each other, and other students, to say nothing of the larger community. Vicarious issues such as the Vietnam war, imperialism in Latin America, and racism in the USA received their attention; but there was little evidence of the sort of collective endeavor which was taking place at McGill. Even the Premier's proposal of October 1967, to place the University under the direct financial control of the government elicited little in the way of reaction from radicals. Only after faculty called a mass meeting in early December did students begin to show even tacit interest in the relationship between university conditions and the events in the larger community which create them. No article or speaker linked the financial issue to the government's practice of curbing public spending on educational services, while being generous in donating tax monies to American corporations. Instead, The Carillon printed articles on American racism (e.g. The Carillon, January

26, 1968) and the like.

However, in February, the student paper published an expose which described how a provincial cabinet minister received a student loan while earning over $18,000 per annum (The Carillon, February 16, 1968). Shortly thereafter, the Board of Governors threatened to crush the Student Union and its newspaper by financial means. The Principal stated that the Board was concerned "about the effect of the editorial policy of The Carillon upon public opinion about the University" (The Carillon, March 8, 1968). Apparently the timing of these events resulted in no action, since they occurred at the end of the term: The Carillon, under its new editor, Norm Bolen, began printing as usual in September.

Bolen's Carillon was far more radical in content than its predecessor. Instructions on how to make Molotov cocktails (September 13, 1968, p. 8), criticisms of local politicians and police (ibid, p. 9), a description of the impoverished living conditions of Saskatchewan Metis (ibid, p. 13), and an admiring portrait of Che Guevara (ibid, p. 13), greeted the readers of the first issue. The second issue (September 20, 1968) included a statement of resignation by the Dean of Arts and Science which contained criticism of the University administration and the provincial government. It also included a scathing attack on the local police, and a call to students for "militant action" against the "arbitrary power" exercised by the Board of Governors.

Students in general appear to have been more militant at Regina in the fall of 1968. However, 1200 students who protested over problems with student loans cannot be said to have been radical (The Carillon, October 3, 1968, p. 3), in spite of editor Bolen's claim (ibid, p. 4) that they had received a "political education" for their efforts and that they now saw beyond "the *images* of democracy." Premier Thatcher, who had refused to discuss the student loan problem with students, was attacked by *The Carillon*, and shortly thereafter, editor Bolen took the issue to the off-campus community, where he cast the issue in terms of "whether the government is meeting its obligation in assisting greater educational opportunity" (*The Carillon*, October 18, 1968, p. 1). However, the public appeared to be indifferent to the matter, as were students. Only Bolen and a few other isolated radicals appeared to want to carry the matter further.

With little student interest in politics in evidence, Bolen's journalism was all that gave a tinge of radicalism to the place for the remainder of the year. This was the case in spite of the fact that more efforts were made by the administration to control *The Carillon* (November 8, 1968, p. 3), and other administrative blunders were committed and exposed (e.g. *The Carillon*, December 6, 1968, p. 1; November 1, 1968, p. 3).

However, when, in January 1969, the Board of Governors announced that they would no longer collect student union fees because the union would not force *The Carillon* to follow an editorial policy that was acceptable to the Board, students, faculty and alumni reacted with disgust (*The Carillon*, January 8, 13, 17, 24, 1969). Students called a boycott and threatened legal action against the Board. On February 7, 1969 *The Carillon* issued a special provincial edition which was distributed throughout the province. Through this medium the students took their case to the prople of the province. The front page of this edition said in part:

> This University belongs to you, the citizen...you pay for most of the cost of the University. We... appreciate this. But we also know...you are

> getting little for your money...we know that the large Eastern and American corporations get most of the benefits. Why don't the people of Saskatchewan benefit?...because it still costs too much to go to University...The majority of university students come from families who earn over $7000 a year.
>
> ...we don't think this is fair. We want the university to be open to...those who really pay for it...The big corporations pay little for the university but they run it...Almost all... members of the...board...are businessmen. What we NEED on this board are farmers, workers... the people of Saskatchewan...We are asking for ...changes...to make the University serve the people of the province.

The remainder of the issue included descriptions of who pays for and who benefits from the University; costs and financing; profiles of the Board members including their business interests and political affiliations; a summary of the events precipitating the controversy; the students' case; and suggestions as to what the public can do about it.

With this "issue" a more active left emerged at Regina. A chapter of SDU appeared (February 14, 1969) which produced data on finance; The Carillon (February 14, 1969) printed an expose on government aid to American industry, as well as an article entitled "Corporate obscenity" which described massive environmental despoilation and corporate robbery financed by corporate welfare. The Carillon described such practices as "the prostration of the powerless for the trammeling of a few" (The Carillon, March 7, 1969). Furthermore, what was described as a "left wing slate" was elected to lead the student body.

However, the left at Regina until the Spring of 1969 was fragmented, lacked a program and initiative, and tended to be capable of only following single issues which were forced on them by a less than friendly and progressive provincial government and a less than dazzling campus administration. Even the radical journalists did not appear to follow a coherent editorial policy. Like the early SUPA, the left at Regina, which before 1968 was in fact composed of SUPA people, exhibited the same characteristics as we saw in our discussion of SUPA above. Analysis was weak. Strategy was limited to variations of petitioning. Little understanding of the distribution and use of power was shown, and no group presented a program for the redistribution of power. Little was said about socialist goals, and in accordance with the fashionable liberal creed, leadership was not vigorously sought, organization was neglected and participatory democracy was idealized (though not realized) (The Carillon, October 17, 24, 1969).

The following year (1970) saw the left at Regina coalesce around such issues as the resources sellout, corporate greed, cultural imperialism, and repressive labour legislation. The Carillon episode of early 1969 appeared to have spurred people out of their torpor. More than a journalistic left was in evidence as there were, for example, demonstrations of solidarity with labour in its battle against the Thatcher government's unprogressive labour legislation (The Carillon, March 20, 1970, p. 1), a protest against the presence of an American Army band (The Carillon, May 21, 1970), demonstrations against warfare research (The Carillon, June 4, 1970), and criticism of the government's imposition of the War Measures Act in the fall of 1970 (The Carillon, October 30, 1970). Furthermore, The Carillon appeared to have developed a more coherent editorial policy. The business world and the Thatcher government began to be dealt with more critically, and more continuity and depth were provided through following the development of a given phenomenon over time. However, Regina's left was still undeveloped compared to the McGill left of the same period. The presence of a social democratic party which could (and did) replace the ruling regime, no doubt drew off the energies of some of the students. Nevertheless, there was clearly no revolutionary presence and relatively little extraparliamentary activity compared with McGill.

The Left and Activism at Simon Fraser University

A piece-meal, ad hoc variety of activism was also more characteristic in the turmoil at Simon Fraser during the first five years of its operation. The turmoil at Burnaby, in many respects, parallels the pattern at some American universities more than that which was manifest at McGill. Simon Fraser's student actions have been more anarchic than programatic; issues have more often become ends in themselves than adjuncts to larger movements; and the ideology and tactics have been more liberal than socialist -- more focused on the individual than the collective. In the SDS-SUPA tradition, Simon Fraser's activists attempted to make a socialist loaf with a liberal recipe. In fact, one of the ingredients, participatory democracy, became an end in itself. The radicals at Simon Fraser exhibited the same pattern as those at Saskatchewan when they ignored the well-established left of British Columbia and followed American examples, ideas and tactics.

Simon Fraser, established in 1965 with much fanfare, apparently presented attractive prospects to radical staff and students (Aberle, op. cit.; Briemberg, op. cit.). The relatively high proportion of arts students present at SFU by itself constituted a condition of higher than usual probability that radicalism would appear.[14] Such students, as we have seen, are more likely to be political radicals, and the presence of a correspondingly greater proportion of arts faculty would constitute a greater probability of support and approval for activism (see Lipset and Ladd in footnote 14).

However, the publicity which preceded and accompanied the establishment of SFU emphasized the opportunities for innovation which Simon Fraser offered as a new institution dedicated to "free and critical inquiry." Furthermore, the opportunity to work in a setting like the Politics, Sociology and Anthropology (PSA) Department which was established and chaired by the famous and scholarly "Marxologist" T. B. Bottomore, was also presented.[15] A new school with none of the inertia that accrues to already established forms, which advertized itself as a haven for innovation and free and critical inquiry, and which included a department organized to minimize fragmentation and headed by a man whose name is commonly associated with that of Marx, must have been particularly attractive to leftist faculty (Briemberg, ibid, p. 36 - 37) and students like Loney, Conway, Harding, Cleveland, and the like. The latter came to a graduate school at Simon Fraser which had no other obvious attractions. Aberle (op. cit., p. 3) claims that the majority of Bottomore's twenty-one member department were "New Left radicals and left liberals." They were, according to Briemberg (op. cit., p. 37), "almost all...recruited... directly from US universities," and they shared "immediate concerns with the struggle against the war in Vietnam, against racism, and against corruption of the universities."

Given the presence of leftist scholars, certain other features of the SFU-British Columbia milieu would have contributed to the probability

---

[14] R. E. Lane and M. Lerner. "Why hard-hats hate hairs", Psychology Today, November, 1970, p. 45 - 48, 104 - 105; S. M. Lipset and E. C. Ladd Jr. "...And what professors think", Psychology Today, November, 1970, p. 49 - 51, 106.

[15] Briemberg (op. cit., p. 37), one of the PSA faculty members, claimed that North American radical faculty were attracted to SFU because they thought of Bottomore as a Marxist.

that turmoil would be created. SFU's Board of Governors was composed of what the student newspaper called "fat cats" of "big business," in a number of articles describing their personal, corporate, and political interconnections (e.g. The Peak, July 3, 1968, p. 3).[16] The Board's Chairman was also: the man who organized the university; the man whose recommendation of his former pupil for the presidency of SFU was accepted by himself and his business associate Board members; the man who was at the same time Chancellor of the University; the man who was the head of BC Hydro and appeared to be a plenipotent of a government that was found to be corrupt,[17] apparently cosy with big business and estranged from labour. Accordingly, the leftists' scrutiny of the actions of the Board and the Chancellor were almost certain to produce heated controversy -- especially when those actions involved interference in academic affairs and the promotion of business interests on campus.

Business incursions on campus became the subject of discussion in the first months of SFU's operation. In October, 1965, The Peak (October 27, 1965, p. 1) announced that Shell Oil had been given a service station site on campus in exchange for advance payment of fees for a long-term lease, which money was to be used to provide a residence to be called "Shell House." Five months later a leftist student journalist, Sharon Yandle, published an expose on another "deal" between the University and business. In this case, the Bank of Nova Scotia was said to have been given a twenty-five year monopoly at SFU and the University had allegedly agreed to "lay off business for five years" (The Peak, March 23, 1966, p. 4). An industrial catering firm which had a monopoly on food services on campus also received the critical attention of The Peak (March 16, 23, 1966; May 25, 1966; June 21, 1967). The same student journalists who maintained a vigilant eye on business activity on campus throughout the 1965-1970 period, used The Peak to give prominence to such matters as a demonstration against business recruiting activities (The Peak, November 15, 1967, p. 1), the appointment of more businessmen to the Board of Governors (December 6, 1967, p. 1) and protests against the "selling" of honorary degrees to industrialists, who, in exchange for the degree "donate money to the university" (May 8, 1968, p. 1 - 2). In fact, throughout SFU's first five years, students writing for The Peak monitored business connections and activities on campus. However, the subjects which received the attention of student journalists did not always produce turmoil. Leftists on campus, in general, failed to exploit the various nefarious events, conditions and arrangements for any obvious purpose. Each instance of turmoil appeared to involve the pursuit of each issue as an end in itself. This was particularly the case from 1965 to 1967.

---

[16] Some of the characteristics of Simon Fraser University's history are very similar to those of "the business university" which E. P. Thompson described in his case study of one such institution in Britain (E. P. Thompson (ed.), Warwick University Ltd., Middlesex: Penguin, 1970).

[17] At least one cabinet minister was sent to jail and another took a holiday from his portfolio subsequent to a series of scandals.

Beginning with protest (a "park-in") over inadequate transportation and parking arrangements (The Peak, December 1, 1965), and fee increases (October 27, 1965), single unconnected issues were the subjects of turmoil during the first years. Although a few isolated leftists were active in publicizing such matters as how the administration appeared to have made agreements to avoid soliciting funds from business for five years (The Peak, March 23, 1966) (thereby implying the reasons why the Board Chairman -- Chancellor forbade students from undertaking a fund drive to finance campus services) only a few isolated incidents occurred. Furthermore, those episodes which did occur were not treated as if the issues had political content. There was, for example, no response to the Bank of Nova Scotia story, even though there was an obvious similarity between what was involved in that arrangement and the Shell Oil deal which did produce turmoil. Even when activists tried to halt construction (The Peak, June 22, 29, 1966) of the Shell station, their utterances suggest that they were doing so for no more esoteric reasons than the prevention of the construction of "an eye sore." However, there was some evidence in The Peak which indicated that some people thought there was more than an aesthetic issue involved in the Shell station affair. For example, an editorial entitled "Something smells" (The Peak, June 15, 1966) implied that some administrators had not been very forthright in their public statements about the issue, and that deception was involved. Again, after it had been censored (July 7, 1966, p. 1) because of "concern" with the impression the paper had been creating off campus, an editorial (July 27, 1966, p. 4) attacked the administration for its "money morality" and its handling of the Shell transaction. Those who were concerned about the off-campus image of the university were treated with sarcasm in the same column. In discussing the Shell issue again in the fall (1967), after senior faculty had publicly attacked the Shell arrangement (The Peak, September 28, 1966), after the Chancellor-Board Chairman had annoyed many people with what The Peak (October 15, 1966, p. 4) called his "silly" utterances, and after another big businessman had been appointed to the Board of Governors (The Peak, October 12, 1966, p. 2), The Peak, in a sarcastic editorial, suggested that businessmen should run everything on campus. However, with no organized and persistent group of leftists to lead and sustain collective resistance to the Shell project; with no organization to help people discover the significance of the presence of

Shell and The Bank of Nova Scotia in broader political terms; without a group to help people make connections between their immediate discomforts and the common source of those conditions, activism remained sporadic, narrow in purpose and insignificant in political content. Accordingly, The Bank of Nova Scotia was ignored and Shell opened with "no boycott" (The Peak, November 23, 1966, p. 3).

In early 1967 however, when The Peak (January 4, 1967, p. 3 - 4) cited cases to show how activism, and not mere lobbying, gets results, the first political activist organization appeared on campus. The isolated leftists, like Sharon Yandle, had organized a chapter of SUPA whose purpose, as announced by Yandle in The Peak (January 4, 1967, p. 6) was:

> to direct students' attention to on and off campus developments which are incompatible with the concept and workings of democracy and to provide a structure for student action in all areas affecting students as members of the university and as members of society.

From this point forward organized political activity gained momentum. A base of support in the student body had become manifest in the campus NDP party which was the largest political party on campus (The Peak, March 23, 1966, p. 1). The NDP group had gained forty-six per cent of the vote for "mock parliament" with a platform that included the advocacy of complete severance of Canada's ties with the USA, withdrawal from NORAD and re-examination of Canada's participation in NATO (ibid, p. 6). Furthermore, leftists had apparently gained control of The Peak and key positions in student government. Accordingly, SUPA's objective of "directing students' attention" was facilitated not only by its literature, films, meetings, and speakers' programme, but by The Peak and student executives as well. In addition, SUPA provided a forum, and The Peak provided publicity for and summary accounts of addresses by radical faculty members in the PSA department. Furthermore, The Peak (January 11, 1967) instituted a political section as a regular feature in which it treated "controversial issues" which were "inadequately handled by local dailies." Imperialism, particularly American imperialism, became a subject of discussion and investigation and was given prominence in The Peak. For example, the January 18, 1967 issue described how "NATO subsidizes SFU Physics Department" and included the first installment of a series of articles on imperialism. The Peak connected the Vietnam war with American imperialism (January 25, 1967, p. 8), discussed that which appeared to be China's posture vis a vis imperialism (February 1, 1967) and continued the series (February 8, 1967, p. 12 - 13) into March. During March, various dimensions of American economic and cultural imperialism in Canada were discussed in the SUPA meetings which were described in summary by The Peak (e.g. March 1, 1967, p. 17; March 8, 1967, p. 1, 4, 12). Sharon Yandle, who was one of the most prominent members of the campus NDP and a driving force in SUPA, served both of those organizations' purposes and those of The Peak very well as a "Political editor." Through her journalism and organizational activities, the isolated leftists were brought together and had more impact on campus life through collective and coordinated action than they had had in isolation.

However, invited and resident American radicals dominated the discussion in the weekly political forums in the mall, the SUPA meetings, and The Peak's political forum which Yandle and her fellow SUPA people organized. Accordingly, the political issues, the ideology, the tactics, the strategies, the examples -- the terms in which political discussion was cast -- were set by Americans. For example, when members of PSA faculty debated the ideology and strategy of the new left in the pages of The Peak (January 25, 1967) the entire content of their remarks was

American: no reference to Canada's left was included in their discussion of differences, tactics, strategies, issues, problems and ideology of the old and new left, even though they were addressing a Canadian audience which was presumably concerned with the Canadian situation. Accordingly, students began to refer to the 2500 student college on Burnaby Mountain as an "impersonal multiversity" which had to be "democratized" (e.g. The Peak, February 8, 15, 1967) so that this "center of Establishment activity," this "center of the means of production...of international capitalism" would be a place where "the people decide" (e.g. The Peak, January 25, 1967) whatever is to be decided! Significantly, The Peak's (March 8, 1967, p. 4) list of "imported bizarre Americana" in Canada did not include American leftist ideology along with Kentucky Fried Chicken and McCarthyism. SFU leftists do not appear to have entertained the possibility that Canadian leftists, as well as other Canadians, could have a colonial mentality or that American radicals could behave in an imperial manner.[18]

Although SFU student radicals realized that the majority of faculty and students did not share the radicals' analysis and ideas, they fought for "democratization" of the university. They do not appear to have realized, as did LaTouche and the Quebec syndicalists, that the replacement of businessmen and administrators with faculty and students would make little change in the goals and content of the university policies and practices to which radicals objected. Nor did the leftists at Simon Fraser, like their counterparts in Quebec, use the democratization campaigns as educational or radicalizing vehicles. The evidence suggests that democratization was an end in itself for many of the activists and, for a few who followed the radical American faculty in PSA, it was to be a means of depriving international capitalism of a vital instrument of power. Nobody gave evidence of an understanding that the little college in suburban Vancouver had no obvious connection to the power base which enabled IT&T, Dow Chemical, General Motors, General Electric or any other sort of general to do what they do. While the "democratization" of Columbia, Michigan State, or Berkeley might inconvenience the "military-industrial complex" if certain research institutes were closed by such means, no such prospect presented itself at SFU. Even relatively sophisticated leftists, like former Regina activist and Carillon editor John Conway, who appeared to have a firm grasp of what was involved in cultural imperialism ("Educational imperialism", The Peak, March 12, 1969, p. 7 - 9), did not realize that student activists at SFU had adopted the analysis and strategies of an American reference group without judging the appropriateness of so doing. The activists, like the non-activists over whom Conway became exasperated because of their colonial mentality, looked to Americans for guidance. Although Conway could describe how and why American-liberal ideas and scholarship were dominant in Simon Fraser's non-radical departments (ibid), he did not demonstrate an understanding of the possibility that, for the same reasons, the ideas and example of American radicals could hold sway in SFU's radical department. While Conway could present forceful arguments as to why Canadians should not allow themselves to be dominated by American culture, he did not apply the same arguments to the realm of radical politics. Accordingly, the leftists at Simon Fraser looked to the USA and the USA in PSA rather than Quebec.

---

[18] The terms "colonial mentality" and "imperial" behavior are used to denote (respectively) the predisposition of colonials to reflexively look to the imperial metropolis for ideas, examples, and other cues as to what is appropriate and the propensity of citizens of a metropolis (whether at home or abroad) to assume that whatever is developed in the metropolis is superior, advanced and a worthy example to follow for non-residents of the metropolis.

The activism of Simon Fraser's leftists was often an ad hoc reaction to some violation of a sacred liberal value. Lacking the programmatic or planned character of such Quebec examples as Operation McGill, the activism at Simon Fraser resembled, and even appeared as a characterization of some American activism, such as that which was in evidence at Berkeley in the so-called "Free Speech Movement" of 1964. For example, Simon Fraser had its own "free speech" turmoil when five teaching assistants (including Martin Loney) were fired by the Board of Governors and arrested by the police for their support of "free speech" in a local high school (The Peak, March 15, 1967, p. 3; March 17, 1967, p. 1 - 2; March 21, 1967, 1 - 5, 8; March 22, 1967; May 10, 1967, p. 1; June 28, 1967; August 9, 1967, p. 1).

Simon Fraser's "free speech movement", otherwise known as "the TA incident", was precipitated by the expulsion from school of a seventeen year old male who had refused to recover all copies of an "underground" poetry journal which he had written to parody a school publication. The teaching assistants had gone to a public ground near the school to help organize student support for the young man. When a group of high school football players began fighting with some of the five or six hundred students who had gathered at a rally, two of the teaching assistants who were speaking to the crowd were arrested for disturbing the peace (i.e. "shouting"). Prior to this rally five teaching assistants had distributed an open letter to the high school student body in which they deplored the expulsion and urged the students to "take any legal action necessary" to "fight for your rights" of free expression (The Peak, March 17, 1967, p. 2). When the Board of Governors fired the five teaching assistants on the (mistaken) grounds that their letter had "recommended contempt for the law" and that "these actions reflected discredit on the University" (ibid, p. 1) both faculty and students were outraged. The Dean of Arts (Bottomore) resigned in protest over the Board's action (ibid), the Student Union, the Faculty Association and various other groups and individuals demanded that the Board rescind its action and reinstate the five teaching assistants (The Peak, March 21, 1967, p. 1). "Thousands" attended a rally called by Student Council which issued an ultimatum that demanded "the unconditional" reinstatement of the five students in question or a general strike on the part of all students and faculty would take place (ibid, p. 5). When the Board rescinded its decision to dismiss the five students after it had "considered the presentation...made by various groups", students at a rally were told by the Student Council President that "it was your united action that impressed the Board".

Like the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, mass action was successful in procuring certain desired outcomes: direct action was reinforced. However, the parallel does not stop there. At SFU, as at Berkeley, the radicals did not appear to know what to do with their victory once they had won* (Buckman, op. cit.). In neither case was there an attempt to make use of what was gained: the Berkeley radicals "didn't know what to say" once they had won free speech (ibid) and the SFU leftists (both faculty and students) did not come to Dean Bottomore's aid when the President and the Board of Governors refused to allow him to retract his letter of resignation (The Peak, March 22, 1967). Nor did the Simon Fraser activists pursue the matter of ensuring that staff members be given documentary guarantees of academic freedom and that the Board of

---

*Sayre (1974) who was witness to "the '69 bust in University Hall" (Harvard) claimed that "for an hour after the bust no one was in charge of Harvard...Anything could have happened, but no one had prepared for that moment" (p. 140).

Governors refrain from interfering in academic matters.[19] In short, free speech at both Berkeley and SFU was pursued as an end in itself - as a single issue campaign. In neither case was a campaign mounted by radicals for purposes of political education or some larger end than the immediate "issue".

In the summer months following the 1967 "free speech" or "TA incident", the non-renewal of contracts and the lack of administration and Board co-operation with faculty who desired to clarify the terms of tenure, contract and academic freedom produced a series of conflicts (The Peak, October 18, 1967, p. 2). When no satisfaction was procured, the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) was called in to investigate (October 25, 1967, p. 1).

Meanwhile, the local SUPA chapter disbanded (The Peak, September 27, 1967) since the national organization had been dissolved during the summer. In SFU, the former SUPA people formed a "New Left Committee" (NLC) which had aims similar to that of SUPA but with "increased emphasis on action" (ibid). According to The Peak, NLC "declared itself neo-marxist", and intended "to organize for a social revolution" (ibid, p. 3). Using the student paper as one medium of propaganda, NCL increased the frequency with which articles on revolution appeared. For example, the September 27, 1967 Peak reprinted an article entitled "Latin America: how many vietnams?". Another issue (October 18, 1967, p. 12) carried a transcript of a speech by Che Guevara on strategy and action as well as accounts of turmoil in Hong Kong. Still another (November 29, 1967, p. R6) included a discussion of guerilla warfare. Similarly, Sharon Yandle, who now was a student representative in the Senate, used The Peak to reveal what occurred in the meetings of Senate, even though such meetings were closed or secret, and even though she was told she couldn't inform the people she was representing (October 25, 1967; November 15, 22, 1967). Yandle described how the University was run by business interests (November 8, 1967, p. R8), included a column which revealed how certain businesses derived benefit from the war in Vietnam (ibid) and told her readers that she and other students who wanted "student power", wanted it because they thought that student control of the universities could produce change in the social order (The Peak, November 22, 1967, p. R6). The accomplishment of student power goals, said Yandle, would necessarily involve struggle since concessions of student representation on the University's governing bodies, while they should be accepted and used to promote student power goals, were inadequate and constituted ineffectual tokenism, the granting of which obscured the issues (ibid). Accordingly, plans were made to disrupt business and Defense Research Board recruitment (ibid), and "non-violent guerilla warfare" techniques were described in The Peak (November 29, 1967, p. R6).

---

[19] Activist Sharon Yandle was an isolated exception. In The Peak (April 5, 1967, p. 14 - 15) she attempted to prod the staff and students into action in a very thorough "post mortem on the strike action". (The strike which was threatened due to Yandle's organizational efforts, was not undertaken because the Board had rescinded its decision to fire the five teaching assistants. Yandle, however, suggested that the Board's initial action and its reluctance to conclude an agreement with faculty on the terms of tenure and academic freedom were significant in that they indicated a need for further action on the part of faculty and students. Furthermore Yandle connected this state of affairs to the larger social condition and suggested that there was a need for a larger social movement).

As these developments were taking place, the Board of Governors and President were facing a more militant faculty who, along with the teaching assistants, organized unions to fight an administration that had the appearance of ineptitude and autocracy (The Peak, November 29, 1967; December 6, 1967; January 17, 1968, p. 11). A statement released by The Teacher's Union and addressed to the University President was printed in The Peak (December 6, 1967, p. 6).

> ...The notion of a professional traditionally connotes persons who are independently employed, who control the conditions of their work, and who determine the criteria of professional competence.
>
> None of these are now applicable to faculty at SFU.
>
> We are employed, to use the president's own term, by 'managers'. We do not regulate the conditions of work, as the president's plans for reorganization... include the delegation of control over academic matters to purely administrative personnel.
>
> Nor do we have full control over the professional standards of our colleagues, as faculty can be dismissed for non-academic reasons.
>
> ...we are treated as employees...
>
> ...we have organized accordingly - in a union.
>
> It is our intention that the union will be more than a response to our present situation. Our aim is to transform the university into a democratically-run institution, primarily concerned with the welfare of students and faculty.
>
> We acknowledge full responsibility to the entire B.C. community, not merely that segment of the society which is represented by the Board of Governors.[20]

Shortly thereafter The Peak (January 24, 1968, p. 1) quoted a number of the Board of Governors as saying that "'the Board is no different from a company's board. We need very strong management below us'".

At the same time, a chapter of Students for a Democratic University (SDU) was formed because "the need for student action at Simon Fraser is acute". (The Peak, January 24, 1968, p. 11). An SDU spokesman announced (ibid) the matters with which the new activist organization was concerned. He said the administration was "increasingly high handed and dictatorial" and because of its "interference in academic concerns" SFU had "already lost our most respected scholar, Professor T. B. Bottomore". In addition, since faculty-administration relations were "rapidly deteriorating" and demands for student representation and other "issues" were not being solved by existing committees, "SDU could be the organization to save Simon Fraser". Among the two hundred who attended the SDU's first meeting were former University of Saskatchewan activists Jim Harding and John Cleveland (The Peak, January 31, 1968, p. 1). At the same meeting faculty members described how the Board of Governors "consistently ignore the wishes of the university", have "willfully attacked" academic freedom[21] and that "we must do something more than talk" (ibid, p. 13).

---

[20] The same issue of The Peak included an announcement and description of a newly appointed member of the Board of Governors. He was another big businessman (December 6, 1967, p. 1).

In February, Student Council and SDU planned a "gate-crashing party" at the next Board of Governors meeting, to protest closed meetings and neglect of student concerns (The Peak, February 14, 1968, p. 1). At the same time, CAUT's investigating team called the administration "feudal" and "inept". The CAUT report said the Board had interfered in areas where it should not have involved itself; that Chancellor Shrum had been running the University's affairs too much on his own; that the President had not been acting on behalf of the faculty as he should, and that a number of changes were imperative (The Peak, February 21, 1968). With censure hanging over the Board of Governors, the Chancellor, and the President, students sat in on the Board's Friday meeting. In the face of this, the Senate on the following Monday opened its meetings to the press and public (The Peak, March 6, 1968). Apparently, direct action produced the desired results.

---

[21] The Board of Governors had recently over-ruled recommendations of faculty with respect to the renewal of a faculty member's contract (This was the "Burstein affair"). (See The Peak, January 26, 1968, special edition).

With the Board, the Chancellor and the President under CAUT censure, and with much faculty and student discontent surrounding it, (The Peak, March 13, 1968, p. 1) the administration proceeded to commit a series of blunders, which in the circumstances almost inevitably produced more turmoil.

The first such blunder was the administration's refusal to act on a faculty recommendation ("with no opposing votes") to hire a distinguished scholar, Professor A. Gunder Frank (The Peak, April 3, 1968, p. 1). The PSA department faculty declared that this was the last of "four appointments, all made with the overwhelming support of members of the Department [which] have been obstructed for non-academic reasons" (ibid). The Peak quoted faculty members who said that the administration has "stalled" for five months because the administrators "felt that Frank's 'abrasive personality' would 'stimulate' an already politically oriented department" (ibid). A statement bearing the signatures of a large majority of the faculty in the PSA Department explained why the PSA people were calling on students and faculty to hire Frank at faculty and student expense (ibid):

> We would normally have waited for the University Committee's final verdict before launching this project. Prof. Frank's appointment, however, has been delayed for the past five months and by the time the verdict is reached this term may be over and the university community dispersed. Prof. Frank must also make his own plans for next year...

In declaring that the excellence of Frank's work was beyond question, the PSA faculty deplored the University's alleged investigation of his political convictions and implied that such investigations were depriving the University of "vital and incisive minds" and placing "free inquiry" in jeopardy (ibid). Immediate support was given the PSA faculty's proposal by graduate students in that department. Accordingly, when a senior administrator[22] attacked the PSA Department in the Senate and the President "warned Senate members that they were to keep the matter quiet" (The Peak, "Special Peak Newsletter", April 10, 1968, p. 1) student senator, Sharon Yandle, called a mass meeting "to make these things public because students have a right to know how this university is governed... Senate was discussing a witch hunt..." (ibid).[23] At this meeting, dissident faculty and students deplored what they considered to be a repressive witch hunt which was being initiated by the administration. When the PSA Chairman (Bettison) was given the task of proceeding with an investigation of such "undetailed charges as 'one cannot pursue the truth in the PSA Department'" (Briemberg, op. cit., p. 38) the second blunder had been committed.

A "university-wide power struggle" against the President gained momentum as more students and faculty became disenchanted with the manner in which the University's affairs were conducted (ibid) and the increasing activism of PSA students and faculty polarized the University population.

---

[22] This administrator (the Science Dean) may have made his charges in reaction to the PSA faculty's charges, since he would be a member of the group against whom the PSA charges were made.

[23] According to The Peak, the Science Dean included among his charges that the PSA Department indoctrinated students and discriminated against those who didn't "hue to the party line".

Senate had previously opened its meetings. This meeting, however, was conducted behind locked doors (ibid). Apparently some students attempted to gain entry (ibid).

In early May, Convocation was disrupted by forty SDU demonstrators who protested the awarding of a degree to an industrialist (The Peak, May 8, 1968, p. 1; May 15, 1968, p. 9) and following that, leftists mounted a campaign of muck-raking in The Peak and a campaign for political power in the university (May 22, 1968) which included the successful capture of student council by a radical slate led by Martin Loney and former Regina activist, John Conway (May 29, 1968). When The Peak published details of the PSA Department's complaints against the administration[24] (The Peak, May 22, 1968) and the text of the CAUT report which censured the Board of Governors and the President (May 31, 1968) the stage was set for turmoil which would virtually paralyze the University. Loney, in an open letter to the PSA Chairman, declared that since "Shrum et al... as representatives of the ruling group in this province" controlled his environment, he intended "to give this control no sanctity by obedience to their organized rituals" (The Peak, May 22, 1968). The faculty voted non-confidence in the President (May 31, 1968) and chose one of its members as "temporary acting president" (June 6, 1968). The student society followed suit and demanded the abolition of the Board of Governors and the offices of president and chancellor "as presently constituted" (May 31, 1968).

In the period from May 31 through the first week of June, confusion over procedures for selecting an acting president resulted in anarchy: the University had three different presidents during the week, and the student body and faculty in their disorganized state held lengthy and chaotic meetings and rallies out of which conflicting decisions emerged (The Peak, June 4, 1968). The Chancellor threatened to close the University unless order was maintained (ibid). In the midst of this disorder the student radicals were ineffectual in giving leadership or direction because they were paralyzed by their adherence to participatory democracy (see The Peak editorial "screwed and confused", June 4, 1968, p. 4). When Faculty Council broke an agreement to choose an acting president that was mutually acceptable to it s committee and a counterpart student committee, some faculty and student leaders were angered (The Peak, June 6, 1968, p. 1). In the middle of this persisting chaos, the PSA Department Chairman, Bettison, resigned and Prof. M. Briemberg was elected to replace him[25] (ibid). Meanwhile, members of SDU occupied the Board room in the administration building, while others demonstrated at different sites in the city (ibid). When the Board agreed to "meet openly" with students to discuss student demands (The Peak, June 19, 1968, p. 7) following the faculty's decision to have a student committee participate in the selection of a new acting president (The Peak, June 12, 1968, p. 1), SDU abandoned its sit-in.

---

[24] This lengthy account included ver batim quotations from officials who admitted that political considerations were involved in not following faculty decisions.

In the period of relative calm which followed, the radicals consolidated their grip on the student government with the Loney, Conway, Harding and Cleveland group comprising the entire executive and 10 of 13 seats on council (The Peak, June 12, 1968, p. 5). At the same time, this group dominated the student paper. Loney's articles in The Peak contain evidence of the extent to which political ideas had informed the actions of the students up to this point. Loney admitted (ibid, July 17, 1968) that student participation in the recent affairs at SFU (now called Louis Riel U.) had been merely reactions to events and that he expected students would continue to act only on a reactive basis "until we get at least that liberated that we can initiate a program of action" (ibid). He also admitted that the pace of events "left little time for speculation" (The Peak, June 12, 1968, p. 5).

---

[25] Former Dean of Arts and head of PSA, T. B. Bottomore wrote a letter to The Peak (see June 6, 1968, p. 5) which criticized the administration and Professor Bettison for undertaking the investigation of complaints about the PSA Department "becuase there is no indication of evidence to support these complaints."

The essays by Loney and other members of his group such as Harding and Dominelli, suggest that the traditional American liberal notion that the educational institutions can change society still dominated the thinking of SFU's activists, in spite of the fact that mass media had attacked them relentlessly (e.g. see The Peak, June 4, June 19, 1968), they had accomplished very little, and that little evidence of off-campus support for their actions and goals was to be found. The building of a larger movement which would encompass such off-campus groups as tenants and labour had been ignored and still only remained as a goal which was to follow "democratization" of the University. Meanwhile, Loney declared that the immediate "things to be done" consisted of "work within... departments for democratic action; selection of an acting President;... discussion...of student demands;...drawing up of a model universities act...for presentation to MLA's; the removal of the Board of Governors..." (The Peak, June 12, 1968, p. 5). Unlike the Quebec syndicalists, the activists at SFU failed to realize that fundamental social change must precede fundamental educational change. SFU activists failed to reflect upon what was important in Chancellor Shrum's statement (The Peak, June 4, 1968, p. 2) that he would maintain control or "the university will be closed" and that "public opinion" would insist on this.[26] The attainment of the activist goal of student control through democratization was excluded by Shrum and precluded by the absence of public support. Nevertheless, the activists proceeded on assumptions which did not take these factors into account. Accordingly, Conway (The Peak, June 26, 1968, p. 5, 7) told students that even though he sensed "a mood of despair," which was "the consequence of political confusion" and of "a lack of...clear political goals," they must "press for the BOG's[27] unqualified resignation ...," press for the "democratization" of departments "on the basis of the principle of parity of power between students and faculty" and "look for a President who is willing to work himself out of a job by eliminating his office."

Students followed Conway's advice (ibid) in spite of the fact that legislation precluded the abolition of the Board and office of the President. They appeared to be oblivious to the possibility that legislators and probably most other observers would be reluctant to support the notion that governance of a modern university could or should be carried out by a group that was so obviously disorganized, naive and aimless as themselves and the faculty. In the absence of a Board, a President, and a sometimes inconvenient, but necessary bureaucracy[28] the university would grind to a halt.

Meanwhile, the activists met resistance. Their attempt to purge

---

[26] "Public opinion" was being shaped by the mass media in such a way as to ensure this.

[27] Board of Governors (BOG).

[28] Some students appear to have believed that they could vote on all decisions that affected themselves and still have time to study.

The Peak of non-activists was resisted (ibid, p. 7) and the Board of Governors dismissed Council's demand for an open meeting to discuss the students' demands which included abolition of the Board (The Peak, July 3, 1968, p. 1; July 24, 1968, p. 3, 6). Furthermore, many faculty were resisting the students' attempts to acquire power (The Peak, July 31, 1968, p. 1 - 2). When faculty chose a new acting president, radical students charged the faculty with "betrayal" (The Peak, August 2, 1968, p. 1) of their agreement to choose the acting president in conjunction with, and with the approval of the students. Conway (ibid) charged the faculty of "bargaining in bad faith." Accordingly, when the fall semester of 1968 began, student discontent was manifested in a following for Loney and Conway's calls for action.[29]

In spite of the fact that the Conway-Harding group[30] maintained a level of support which had in the semester just passed, been sufficient to give the activists control of student government, negative reaction to the radicals was manifested in a record vote which replaced the "student power" slate with one referred to as "moderate" (The Peak, September 25, 1968, p. 14; October 9, 1968). Given this state of affairs, the activists resolved to increase their opposition "outside the channels" (September 25, 1968). A meeting for the reorganization of SDU drew 150 students (October 9, 1968, p. 20) whose resolve to increase pressure for democratization was informed not only by a familiarity with the reaction of the conservative students, but also by a hazy awareness that the new president was preparing to put brakes on the "democratization" measures (The Peak, October 30, 1968, p. 13) with the support of faculty.

---

[29] Both Conway and Loney had anticipated this turn of events and had said (e.g. The Peak, June 26, 1968) that students would turn to more direct action if they were betrayed.

[30] Loney, who by now had become familiar to students across the country, thanks to the press publicity given to his activism and personal details (e.g. his thesis on the Cuban Revolution), was elected to the presidency of CUS with the slogan "out of confrontation comes consciousness" (e.g. The Peak, September 4, 1968, p. 1).

During the summer, the PSA faculty and students had implemented a "parallel-parity" structure within the department. Two plenums were formed, one consisting of PSA faculty and one comprising all students taking a course from the department. Each plenum had parallel faculty and student committees with equal power to initiate proposals and "neither plenum could initiate policy against the veto of the other" (Aberle, op. cit., p. 4; also see Briemberg, op. cit., p. 39 - 42). Since all faculty committees had student counterparts with equal voting power, students were involved in decisions such as those involved in hiring, salaries, contracts, tenure, budgets and curriculum (Aberle, op. cit., p. 4). Furthermore, faculty, students, and ancillary staff had access to all files and all meetings were open to everyone as well (ibid; Briemberg, op. cit.). In addition, the PSA Chairman was elected, and attempts were made to abolish all hierarchies (Aberle, op. cit.).[31] Accordingly, when the University's new Acting President, Strand, issued a series of proposals in the fall of 1968, student activists like John Cleveland (The Peak, October 30, 1968, p. 13), who had taken part in the selection of the Acting President, suspected that the proposals were designed to rationalize an investigation of the PSA Department and form the basis of action which would undo what the PSA people had done to "democratize" the department. (These activists had discovered in the course of selection of an Acting President that Strand's "philosophy of education" was not to their liking and it was this discovery which was the basis of their reluctance to give their assent to Strand's appointment).

---

[31] The descriptions of the organizational details given by Professors Aberle and Briemberg in their separate accounts are corroborated by another paper which includes documents. This paper was prepared by a group from the PSA Department. ("Who has broken contract with whom?" PSA Department, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby 2, B.C., September 30, 1969).

In this context, the activists issued a lengthy report (The Peak, October 30, 1968) which included among its proposals, an implicit demand that all departments in the University follow the PSA example. "Participatory democracy" (i.e. direct or primary democracy) was to blossom on Burnaby Mountain so that, in the words of the students' choice for the Presidency of SFU, John Seeley (The Peak, October 23, 1968, p. 15) there would be no more "minds and souls...twisted, distorted, dehumanized and brainwashed" by the disorder that those in power call order. For those who saw the University as a vital instrument by which a powerful class maintained itself and its interests at the expense of the less powerful classes, this was a means of changing the distribution of power. From this "red base" at the University, a movement to overthrow the ruling system could be initiated. Those activists who felt that primary democracy was a desirable end in itself, had a community of interest with the "red base" strategists.

While the campus groups were polarized over the democratization measures, a series of events was building up to a dramatic episode in November. SDU chapters from the several post-secondary institutions in B.C. had met at U.B.C. in early October. At that meeting, problems of transferring from one institution to another, including "accreditation" and "political discrimination" were discussed and case histories of students with such problems were assembled (The Peak, November 28, 1968,

p. 8). Later meetings, (on November 2 and 3, 1968) made plans for a rally and teach-in at SFU to dramatize four demands:[32]

1. Freedom of transfer and automatic acceptance of credits within the B.C. public educational system;
2. An elected parity student-faculty admissions board;
3. The opening of all administration files;
4. More money for education...(ibid).

Following the SDU "plan" 500 students from various B.C. colleges occupied the SFU administration building on November 14 to protest SFU's admissions policies and the failure of admissions committees to answer any of the four demands (The Peak, November 20, 1968, p. 1; November 28, 1968, p. 8). In response to the demonstration and occupation, President Strand promised a special meeting of the SFU Senate to discuss the four demands (ibid). Accordingly, the students assembled again on the day of the scheduled meeting, and, at the rally, made plans to attend the meeting. When the Senate refused to discuss the matter while the students were present, students decided to occupy the administration building again. The occupation continued until the afternoon of November 23, when, on Strand's request, RCMP officers arrested and removed the last 114 persons who remained to the end of the four day occupation (ibid).

While students "voted overwhelmingly to support the occupation" and the Student Society Executive "unanimously condemned Strand's action in calling in the police" and called for his resignation, the faculty clearly supported the President's action (The Peak, November 25, 1968). However, when documents were published which appeared to incriminate the administration in practicing "social, political and financial discrimination" in admission practices, aiding RCMP under-cover work on campus, and investigating the political biases of faculty and students, some faculty members saw the basis of students' demands and justification for their actions (e.g. see The Peak, November 28, 1968, p. 5). Furthermore, the revelations and the police action brought thousands of students out. They threatened a general strike, picketed on and off campus (ibid, p. 9), and met repeatedly in large rallies. Students demanded that charges against the arrested students be dropped (The Peak, December 2, 1968) and that the Senate deal with the four original demands. Meanwhile, student journalists continued to publish details of documents (purloined by those who occupied the administration building), which were embarassing to the University officials[33] (e.g. ibid, p. 2). Accordingly, the arrival of the new year was greeted by a highly aroused campus population.

---

[32] Meanwhile, American "Yippie," Jerry Rubin and two to three thousand UBC students "liberated" (occupied and used) the UBC faculty club for 24 hours and a B.C. cabinet minister, who had been associated with government scandals, expressed his admiration for George Wallace and his ideas for dealing with campus radicals (The Peak, October 30, 1968, p. 3, 5).

According to Aberle (op. cit., p. 13) "PSA faculty took no part in planning" the confrontations and occupation. However, she claims that of those students arrested, "many" were "from PSA." In addition, "most" PSA faculty "signed statements condemning the President for calling the police" (ibid, p. 14) and "some went to stand between police and students if violence occurred." In spite of this, Aberle wrote, "most faculty condemned" PSA faculty "for supposedly inciting the demonstration" and "after November, administrators made it plain that they were out to get the majority in PSA by any means necessary" (ibid, p. 14).

---

[33] What appeared to be evidence of land speculation involving the Chancellor and SFU property was published at this time. Previously published correspondence between the same man and a Canadian Senator indicated that the Chancellor was arranging special favors (such as admission without adequate marks) for the Senator's daughter. (The Peak, November 25, 1968).

Without evidence of a conspiracy available, one cannot judge what was behind the "campaign of slander"[34] directed at the PSA faculty following the events of November, 1968. However, there is no doubt that a remarkable amount of invective and rumours (which were demonstrably false -- perhaps libelous and defamatory) were printed in the Vancouver press and circulated on campus. PSA faculty were accused of "terrorism" (allegedly making threatening phone calls to colleagues), and their teaching, grading methods, hiring practices, budgeting, public lectures, research, intellectual honesty and morality were maliciously attacked (e.g. see The Sun, February 14, 15, 1969; and The Peak, February 19, 1969).

When reporters from The Peak investigated some of the allegations and discovered them to be false, the details were reported along with editorial comments. The Peak reminded its readers that the charges by PSA faculty members that non-academic and political criteria were used in making appointments had been supported with documentary evidence (part of which was reprinted) (ibid, p. 16). Furthermore, the editor reminded students that the PSA Department had accommodated student demands for democratization and implied that politically ambitious faculty and administrators were fabricating rumours and making scurrilous accusations to gain political milage and avoid having to give up some of their power to the students (ibid). In addition, these same people were accused of using the Senate and administrative devices to punish the PSA people

---

[34] Aberle (op. cit.), by implication and innuendo appears to have believed that the administrators were behind the "campaign of slander" (e.g. see p. 14 - 15).

(ibid). Aberle (op. cit., p. 14) claims the PSA "faculty's energies were so absorbed in defending the department and justifying their existence that they barely had time to teach their students let alone pursue new research" during the period from Christmas 1968 to the spring of 1969. In this context, The Peak suggested that the attack on the PSA Department was, in effect, an attack on the students' demands for democratization and that students must "confront the power structure" for the "immediate implementation of the original demands" (e.g. see The Peak, March 5, 1969, p. 6; May 28, 1969, p. 2).

Operating in accordance with that perspective, John Conway ran for and won a seat in the Senate on a platform which included promises that he would

> 1. initiate a series of motions condemning Strand and his hacks for the use of police on campus, as well as their roles in events leading up (sic) and following the bust;
> 2. seek a satisfactory resolution of the four demands regarding admissions and arbitrary discrimination...
> 3. initiate a series of motions deriving from the Student Implementation Committee Report which will confront... faculty elite power;
> 4. engage in debates with senior faculty, with the de facto agent of American imperialism, Strand;
> 5. continuously propose radical...solutions to...problems (The Peak, February 12, 1969).

When Conway undertook the implementation of his program in Senate (with an audience of students present), the senators voted to close Senate meetings (The Peak, April 2, 1969, p. 1). In attacking the move (as unwarranted) and chastizing his fellow senators for not recognizing that if students had more adequate numbers in Senate they would not need to demonstrate, Conway told students that they would have to open Senate if the senators wouldn't (The Peak, April 2, 1969, p. 5). When students attempted to do so, they were blocked by a cordon of guards (The Peak, April 10, 1969, p. 1). Furthermore, their requests for the consideration of a referendum on student parity in Senate was rejected (ibid). Reporters for The Peak (ibid) claimed that "most of the students present felt the Senate was deliberately trying to provoke them into rash action." Accordingly, they left the scene to attend to exams and Conway prepared to run again for re-election in the vain hope that by struggling in the Senate for "direct democracy in all matters that affect our lives" (The Peak, April 2, 1969, p. 10) he would make progress toward that end.[34]

When Conway lost his bid for re-election, when the activist slate was defeated, (The Peak, May 21, 1969, p. 3; June 4, 1969, p. 3) when PSA appointments were vetoed (The Peak, May 14, 1969, p. 2) and when the faculty failed to support PSA faculty members who were being dismissed (even when the cases for dismissal were very flimsy) (e.g. The Peak, April 2, 1969; May 28, 1969; June 4, 1969; September 3, 1969) there can be little doubt that the majority of the campus population (as well as the off-campus population) had rejected the option of tolerating the radicals. Accordingly, the radicals' political activities became almost entirely defensive. The anti-radical forces on campus seized the initiative. What Loney (The Peak, July 17, 1968) called "the politics of reaction" was all the radicals could manage until the "purge" of PSA was completed in 1970. The only exceptions to this state of affairs involved the aggressive muckraking of student journalists who, for example, exposed the scandalous fraud in government's granting of corporate welfare to Ford Motor Company (The Peak, March 4, 1970, p. 16) and other ridiculous matters such as monopoly in the mass media (ibid).

---

[34] Since the PSA activists had established a version of direct democracy in their own department and led the drive for its implementation throughout the University, one can understand how those who opposed them regarded their efforts as destructive and their goals as undesirable. Besides the fact that paralysis of decision-making was an evident result of the radicals' behavior, and the government upon whom the University depended for operating funds had shown its readiness to use "dollar-discipline" to curb any activities it didn't like, the prevailing ideas about the university defined such actions and goals as those pursued by the radicals as unacceptable. For example, President Strand said with candor, if not with logical consistency, (The Peak, April 2, 1969, p. 1) that "the university serves society and we happen to live in a capitalist society. The university must remain neutral or silent to uphold academic freedom. Moral judgments should be made by individuals, not institutions." Accordingly, the activists and their goals could be seen as destructive and the PSA faculty who supported the students could be regarded as complicit in whatever the students did that was destructive.

After the PSA Department was put under trusteeship (external control), and its governing "parity structure" and elected chairman (Briemberg) were replaced (The Peak, July 16, 1969) the contracts of PSA's radical professors began to be terminated. From this point onward turmoil at Simon Fraser, with few exceptions,[35] consisted of strikes and other actions in support of PSA faculty who were being dismissed (e.g. see The Peak, September 24, 1969). Massive as some of these actions were, they failed to produce the desired results of retaining the PSA faculty in question, or the student parity measures. The six week strike which began September 24, 1969 involved eight professors and over two thousand students who merely demanded that the department be restored to the control of those within it; that the department's elected chairman be recognized; and that new contracts be negotiated for the professors (Aberle, op. cit., p. 2 - 3).[36]

---

[35] One exception occurred when in May (1969) students protested the raise in food prices at the privately-operated food concessions on campus (The Peak, May 14, 1969). Single-issue incidents such as this arose from time to time, but campus radicals failed to exploit them for larger purposes.

[36] The account is corroborated by Briemberg (op. cit.), the PSA document "Who has broken contract with whom?" (op. cit., in footnote) and reports in The Peak.

The strike failed; and with that failure the turmoil on Burnaby Mountain atrophied.

Repression took its toll: radical professors were removed as were radical teaching-assistants; PSA Department classes were suspended; injunctions against picketing and"all strike activity" were procured (Briemberg, op. cit., p. 53); and law suits were initiated. These measures produced "despair" among the disorganized radicals. The activists' political naivete and their devotion to the liberal illusion that primary, direct, or "participatory" democracy can and should be implemented in a capitalist context appears to have guaranteed this fate: when one depends on such a process one must have support.

No significant off-campus support was cultivated, and accordingly, none was forthcoming when the campus activists were under attack. At the same time, most faculty members were estranged from the radicals. According to Briemberg (ibid) many still believed that educational institutions can and should be apolitical or neutral; that scholarship could be "value-free"; that the university teacher was an "independent professional" lacking the characteristics of wage labour. Aberle (op. cit.) tells us that the majority of PSA faculty repudiated these beliefs and formulated three goals, the pursuit of which produced conflict between the larger non-radical groups on campus.

The first of "PSA's goals" (ibid, p. 6 - 8) was "to present to students, and further develop with them, a radical analysis of world society." This involved "going to the root of significant social problems." Accordingly, the following were the subject of study:

> the character, development, and effects of imperialism... the roots of underdevelopment; the sources and comparative history of revolutionary movements and movements of

> protest and reform; the analysis of classes and class conflict in industrial capitalist, subjugated capitalist, and socialist societies; the history of modern racism and of struggles against it..., the subordination of women..., and the sources of such evils as modern genocide, poverty, population problems, environmental destruction, and pollution and war (ibid, p. 6 - 7).

The radicals working "from one or another adaptation of a Marxist perspective" wanted to develop students who would "struggle to improve" society (ibid, p. 7).

The second of "PSA's goals" was "to change the relationships among teachers, students and secretaries from a hierarchical structure of command, obedience, and selective individual reward and punishment, into a democratic, learning -- and service community..." (ibid, p. 7). This community was to be "self-governing with respect to its internal work and relationships" with students and faculty having parity in the decision making process. In these circumstances, Aberle (ibid, p. 11) and her colleagues felt that grading (i.e. assigning marks to student work) "partly destroyed or made hypocritical their efforts to exchange ideas freely, to help the neediest students, to undercut competition and enhance collective learning, welfare and consciousness and to promote a critical social science." Apparently, high grades were uniformly assigned (ibid, p. 11 - 12). This practice was rationalized as follows (ibid, p. 12):

> if we used conventional standards, the students to whom we felt obliged to give lower grades were often students from the Third World, rural or poor urban backgrounds or from ethnic minorities, whose English skills were less developed or who had grown up with few books around them. Yet these were precisely the students we mort wanted to interest in our critique of imperialism.

Accordingly, the PSA people sought the elimination of "anachronistic and harmful features of capitalist relationships" and the infusion of "a socialist consciousness" by restructuring work relationships (ibid, p. 9).

The third "PSA goal" was for faculty and students to "relate themselves and their work to the struggle of oppressed peoples" (ibid, p. 8). The "processes of capitalism, imperialism, and revolution," rather than the disciplines of political science, sociology and anthropology were the phenomena to which work was oriented (Briemberg, op. cit., p. 41). The purposes of research became a concern and the questions "knowledge for what?" and "for whom?" assumed importance. Briemberg (ibid, p. 42) claims that the PSA people accepted "with increasing conviction" the proposition that knowledge is "monopolized by those who oppress." Apparently, the PSA faculty believed that the intellectual workers, in exchange for money, study and supply information to the powerful who use that knowledge to maintain their advantages and subjugate the less powerful. According to this view, research is financed by government and private agencies which serve the interests of the powerful (and call it the national interest). Gough[37] (1968) cites examples of scholars whose work was financed by the American CIA and private foundations, and whose findings were used in counter-insurgency activities which were undertaken to protect the private investments (i.e. exploitation of the natives) of the bourgeoisie. As another PSA professor, Martin Nicolaus, suggested (Briemberg, op. cit., p. 42) "social scientists stand with their palms up and their eyes down -- palms up to take money from the powerful, eyes down to study the powerless in the interests of the sponsor." Accordingly, PSA scholars explored the sources of finance for research and exposed "the levers and sources of power" in the interest of the "liberation" of the oppressed (ibid, p. 43).

---

[37] Gough is the same person as Aberle. Some of her papers are signed Kathleen Gough, while others are signed Kathleen Aberle and still others bear the name Kathleen Gough Aberle.

One of the means used to attain the PSA goals was the establishment of a lecture series which consisted of lectures and seminars given by radical scholars (e.g. see The Peak, January 29, 1969, p. 14). Included in one such series were Harry Magdoff, Ernest Mandel, Eric Wolf and Herbert Marcuse (Briemberg, op. cit., p. 41 - 42). Since the speakers were, apparently, all leftists, the notion that PSA had a "party line" to which all had to "toe" might have been reinforced by this highly visible manifestation of the department's activities. Furthermore, since Marcuse, who visited the campus in late March 1969, had some of his ideas discussed in very sympathetic terms by Jim Harding in the pages of The Peak (April 2, 1969, p. 7 - 8), those who suspected that the PSA Department encourages change in the university through "violence", and those who charged that PSA people did not tolerate deviance from their "line", may have interpreted Harding's article as evidence which confirmed their worst fears. For example, Harding (ibid) quoted Marcuse: "...within a repressive society, even progressive movements threaten to turn into their opposite to the degree to which they accept the rules of the game". In addition, and in the same approving manner, Harding printed Marcuse's notion that "...in the contemporary period, the democratic argument for abstract (pure) tolerance tends to be invalidated by the invalidation of the democratic process itself." Accordingly, critics of the PSA Department could point to Harding's conclusion (that "it won't be long before pure tolerance for...so-called authorities here will be gone") (ibid), as evidence that PSA people are intolerant rule breakers who would use violence and intimidation to force people to "toe the party line" (Briemberg, op. cit., p. 44).

In short, the majority of SFU faculty "kept quiet" while the administration removed "PSA's trouble makers" and with them "student rebellion" (Aberle, op. cit., p. 15). Without substantial faculty or off-campus support the call of a radical faculty and student minority for democratization of the university in the face of repression was pitiful. The activists' use of confrontation produced reaction rather than radicalization.

Unlike the syndicalists in Quebec, PSA activists did not exhibit an understanding of the social milieu's impact on the educational institution. They appeared to believe that the educational institutions could change the society. They failed to understand that changes (or lack of changes) in society are recapitulated in the academy. An exaggeration of the importance of the university in the operation of the political economy may have been made by the activists. In seeking freedom, they failed to take account of necessity, a knowledge of which is a precondition for freedom.

By accepting the liberal idealism of participatory democracy, they were accepting the rules of the liberal game -- a game that is fixed by the distribution of power in the political economy from which the university derives its people and money. Accordingly, to paraphrase Marcuse (The Peak, April 2, 1969), their progressive movement turned into its opposite: the majority favored repression of the activists' agitation, struggle and confrontation, and the restoration of what it considered to be law and order. Yandle[38] summarized the case in succinct terms when she wrote: "PSA assumed its own perceptions were shared by those they

---

[38] Sharon Yandle "The end of PSA at Simon Fraser University", Canadian Dimension, 6, 7 February-March, 1970, 16 - 19.

(sic) were trying to reach." All that had to be done was make information available and it would be interpreted in the same manner as the activists interpreted it. Consequently, "PSA acted as if its role was to expose the university (and those within it)"...However, "the would-be exposers seemed almost alone in not knowing what they exposed."[39] The purposes of democratization remained abstractions -- "high ideals which bobbed around helplessly in a sea of dialogue. Had PSA...truly placed itself in the service of the (genuinely) disadvantaged...it might have been able to develop" a larger movement which could act beyond the isolation of the campus.[40]

Absorption in meetings, in endless debates and pseudo-struggles of a rhetorical sort, in a word, devotion to participatory democracy, prevented the activists from attending to the realities of power distribution in their context. Aberle (op. cit., p. 8) admits that almost all of the PSA people were unfamiliar with the Canadian situation. Ideas and analyses, issues and definitions were brought from the American metropolis and applied to the hinterland situation: the little arts college was described and treated as if it were a Berkeley-style "multiversity" which was allegedly a vital instrument for the maintenance of the international capitalist order.

Turmoil at the University of Alberta

Activists at the University of Alberta in the 1960's were not involved in as much turmoil as their counterparts at McGill, SFU or Regina. Manifestations of turmoil were episodic and infrequent, and a smaller proportion of the student body at Edmonton became involved in leftist politics. Whereas the NDY-NDP was always one of the two largest conventional political groups at Regina, McGill and SFU during the latter half of the '60's, it failed to attract an equivalent amount of support at the Edmonton campus. Furthermore, while such activist groups as CUCND-SUPA were present on the Alberta campus, their impact was less profound than at the other three campuses. Most turmoil which occurred before 1968 was associated with single issues such as fee increases. While SUPA was active in distributing literature and participating in the traditional peace marches, disruptive actions were very rare during the mid-sixties. Those direct actions in which students participated were usually associated with off-campus single-issues. Not until the last two years of the decade did radical-leftists organize a more comprehensive political action program. Until then, single, liberal issues were the basis of the little activism that had visibility.

---

[39] Ibid, p. 19.

[40] Ibid, p. 17.

In the early years of the decade, statements and other actions of government officials provoked sporadic protest in the university. For example, in November 1963, (The Gateway, November 15, 1963, p. 4) a senior provincial cabinet minister was reported to have said that "professors may teach only those ideas which the culture and concepts of the age find acceptable (sic)." A few students and faculty protested this apparent official circumscription of academic freedom (The Gateway, November 19, 1963; November 5, 1965). Similarly, a small group of faculty and students protested the election of a city official who had been involved in a scandal. Protestors also demonstrated against police action which was taken against the demonstrators (and not taken against a mob which attacked them) when the civic election protest was underway in the fall and winter of 1963 (e.g. The Gateway, October 25, 29, 1963; November 1, 8, 15, 1963; December 13, 1963). Another instance of government action adds irony to this pattern: a threat by the Premier (The Gateway, February 14, 1964) that the continuance of demonstrations against fee increases (The Gateway, January 31, 1964) would prejudice government co-operation in the future, was effective in terminating the demonstrations. However, many of the numerous instances of government meddling in the affairs of the university were ignored by all but a few faculty and student journalists. Although a few students complained about RCMP activities on campus (surveilance of communist activities) (The Gateway, October 29, 1963) and student journalists rebuked cabinet ministers for their attacks on professors' free expression (e.g. The Gateway, November 13, 24, 1964; December 4, 8, 1964), little support for faculty protests (e.g. The Gateway, December 15, 1964) was evident in the students' behavior. Only faculty members appeared to be ready to demonstrate their objections, in concrete terms, to a government which was regarded as corrupt (e.g. Robin Matthews in The Gateway, December 8, 1964), meddlesome and authoritarian (e.g. Williamson in Commonsense, cited in The Gateway, December 11, 1964). Progressives on campus regarded the provincial government as an "anti-intellectual", arrogant, restrictive, aggressive, authoritarian group which was guided by primitive religious dogma. For example, a university chaplain was reported to have attacked the government in these terms (The Gateway, December 18, 1964, p. 12). Similarly, faculty journals, (e.g. Edge) and muckraking periodicals (Commonsense), as well as the occasional student publication (e.g. The Gateway supplement "Inside", January 29, 1965) made the same sort of complaints. However, although a few professors charged that the government was arrogant, philistine (e.g. The Gateway, November 5, 1965) and used "fear" to maintain "control" (The Gateway, December 18, 1964), the criticism was framed more in populist than socialist terms: "unscrupulous 'interests'" (Lasch, 1969, op. cit., p. 7) were conspiring to create a climate in which education's enlightening rays could not penetrate the cultural fog created by the philistine fundamentalists. A class analysis of the basis of the governing ideas was lacking. The government was merely "corrupt" (e.g. The Gateway, December 8, 1964) and meddlesome (e.g. The Gateway, November 3, 13, 17, 20, 24, 27, 1964).

However, in 1965, evidence of a more progressive element in the student body became manifest. The student body elected a Council president who was less parochial than his recent predecessors. At the same time, an editor with a conception of journalism that was more inclusive than the traditional football and fraternities fare, was appointed to head The Gateway staff. In addition, the SUPA people became bolder. Accordingly, attempts were made to politicize the student body. The Gateway (e.g. September 22, 1965) began to print articles on social issues, the student's role in society and social change. Subjects such as "managing the news," "battle for a new social order" (The Gateway, October 1, 1965, p. 4), student syndicalism (September 24, 1965), "consumerism" (October 15, 1965), "revolt among the young," the war in Vietnam and other matters beyond the campus, gained new prominence in the student newspaper. Under the new student president (Richard Price), students started an "action program" (The Gateway, October 27, 1965) which included "teach-ins" and agitation for the advancement of the goals of the Canadian Union of Students (CUS). The Gateway (ibid) announced that "students will employ teach-ins, marches, demonstrations" and other means "in an attempt to create a new public awareness of the issues of education..." one of which was "universal accessibility" to the universities. Similarly, the SUPA defied the administration's ban on "political" booths in university buildings and continued its distribution of information (The Gateway, December 1, 1965). Nevertheless, that which was considered to be radical at the time was rather limited and certainly not a common phenomenon at the University of Alberta when the mid-point of the decade was reached. Richard Price could call the Student Christian Movement (SCM) seminar series on the university ("University Seminar") "a radical course" (Price, in Roussopoulos, 1970, op. cit., p. 43). At Edmonton, when the second half of the sixties began, the "critical questioning of the institution" (ibid) was relatively "radical" behavior for students.

Students began to explore questions which were raised by faculty members and visiting speakers. For example, the "value of troublemakers" (The Gateway, November 24, 1965, p. 4) and "the necessity of civil disobedience" (The Gateway, December 1, 1965, p. 6) received attention. Similarly, topics such as the distribution of poverty (The Gateway, January 7, 1966) and the relationship between educational achievement and social class (The Gateway, January 26, 1966) were raised. Even the question of Canadian independence of action was brought to the attention of The Gateway's readers (February 18, 1966). However, administration initiatives were still powerful influences in determining where progressives focused their attention. Actions of the administration in dealing with the anti-war efforts of SUPA (The Gateway, December 17, 1965) and a tenure dispute in the Department of Philosophy (The Gateway, February 2, 4, 9, 18, 23, 25; March 2, 11, 17, 1966) brought the issue of "the distribution of power" into higher relief.

The pursuit of faculty control of academic affairs had been an issue on campus in the recent past (The Gateway, December 13, 1963; December 15, January 10, 1964). At least one of the professors who was being denied tenure had, in his public statements, (e.g. The Gateway, December 18, 1964; November 5, 1965) in effect insisted that the question had not been properly settled. Furthermore, statements by the President (e.g. The Gateway, December 4, 1964; January 29, 1965) tended to confirm such a belief. The continuing attacks on critical academics by provincial government members also kept the issue alive. In late October 1965, Price and other students requested student representation on the Board of Governors (The Gateway, October 29, 1965, p. 1): twenty-five percent control was requested by council (The Gateway, November 5, 1965).

Beside the news of student activism on other campuses, students were encouraged to pursue student power by a series of on-campus events which included the tenure dispute. Just before news of the tenure affair broke, two members of the Board of Governors spoke in favor of student representation on the Board (The Gateway, January 17, 1966, p. 1). Shortly thereafter, the "New Young Leader" (Charles Taylor, 1970, op. cit., p. 7 - 11) of the provincial Conservatives (Peter Lougheed) called for student activism (The Gateway, January 21, 1966, p. 1) and the President of the University was reported to have said that in the "line of authority" the students' role in "unclear" (ibid, p. 2). Accordingly, when the tenure dispute was reported (February 2, 1966) students became involved. The Gateway (February 4, 9, 1966) discussed the affair in terms of whether or not the dismissal of the professors was a matter of "ability or compatibility." According to Price (in Roussopoulos, op. cit., p. 43), the tenure dispute "brought to light existing structural inadequacies." Some students saw the problem in terms similar to those used by one of the central figures who appeared to have been treated unjustly in the dispute: Williamson described the issue as one of "democracy and professional standards in the department" (The Gateway, February 23, 1966, p. 7). Another professor (Matthews) who came to the defence of the professors who were being fired called for the "democratization" of the university (The Gateway, March 17, 1966, p. 1, 5; December 14, 1966). Price (in Roussopoulos, op. cit.) implies that these events inspired a move to more radical action.

The SCM and SUPA people began to collaborate more closely.[41] "New Left Activism" (The Gateway, November 25, 1966) became a subject of shared interest.[42] Price, an SCM leader, tells us that the Edmonton chapter of the SDU evolved out of this collaborative enterprise in the spring[43] of

---

[41] Actually SUPA and SCM had collaborated at least as early as 1965 (see SUPA Newsletter, 1, 12, December, 1965, p. 21).

[42] As in many other centers in Canada, the local supporters of the Student Christian Movement (SCM), SUPA, New Democratic Youth (NDY) and Canadian Union of Students (CUS), were not infrequently members or supporters of several or all of these organizations. For example, SUPA people were frequently at work under banners other than that of SUPA: "as usual the (SUPA) programmes will not necessarily be under the banner of SUPA or a new organization" (SUPA Newsletter, vol. III, 9, July, 1967, p. 1). (In addition, see Peter Warrain (former CUS President and SUPA member) "On strategy in a non-revolutionary era" SUPA Newsletter, vol. III, July 9, 1967, p. 8). Even a cursory examination of the NDY periodical Confrontations (e.g. December 1967/January 1968) and the SUPA Newsletter (e.g. list of contacts -- "worklist" -- vol. II, 3, February 21, 1966, p. 23 - 26) reveals an indication of the extent of common membership. As one member wrote: "SUPA's...people tend to spend most of their time in a variety of non-SUPA organizations..." (SUPA Newsletter, vol. III, 1, November 14, 1966, p. 13 - 14).

[43] Actually SDU was in existence as early as February 1968. The Gateway (February 27, 1968) reported that the local SDU was not contesting elections: it was "interested in educating not controlling."

1968 (Price, in Roussopoulos, op. cit., p. 43). Meanwhile, a series of war protests were organized and supported by the NDY -- SCM -- SUPA people (e.g. The Gateway, November 16, 1966; October 24, 1967). These modest actions, the "University Seminar", a memorial rally for Che Guevara (The Gateway, November 2, 1967, p. 8) and the unsuccessful NDY by-election campaign (on a syndicalist platform) (Confrontations, December 1967/ January 1968, p. 1 - 6) represented the few bits of evidence of a leftist presence in a student body which was both politically impoverished and dominated by rightists.[44] Apparently the student leftists "at what is perhaps Canada's most conservative university" (The Peak, October 30, 1968, p. 12) were trying to educate a constituency (The Gateway, February 27, 1968) and clarify ideology, policies and programs. Jon Bordo, a McGill alumnus and SUPA member, who had worked with Stan Gray in the development of a "neo-Marxist ideology of social change" (New Left Committee (NLC) Bulletin, Vol. I, No. 1, October 1967, p. 12) played a prominent role in program development and organization (e.g. see Price, in Roussopoulos, op. cit., p. 44). As a member of the National NLC, Bordo was "mandated to...'carry on educational activities...and take other measures designed to further the development of the new left in Canada'" (New Left Committee Bulletin, I, 1, October 1967, p. 6C). Included in the means for developing "a mass...radical movement" was the development of communications between various youth and working class groups. Bordo's work with SCM and NDY people was apparently part of the strategy to develop "a creative synthesis, practical and theoretical, of the new left and socialist traditions in Canada" (ibid, p. 6C).

---

[44] The present usage of the term "rightist" is based on the ideas of Kolakowski (op. cit.). Kolakowski defined "the Right" as "a conservative force...; its essence is the affirmation of existing...conditions...or else a desire to revert to a state which was once an accomplished fact. The Right strives to idealize actual conditions" (p. 149). Accordingly, people of the Right embody "the inertia of historical reality..." Their behavior is "the expression of capitulation to the situation of the moment" (p. 53). Backed by the inertia of established customs and institutions rightists often have contempt for ideology. This contempt can be a strength "because it allows for greater flexibility in practice and for the arbitrary use of any verbal facade that will facilitate the seizure of power" (p. 156). Without a utopia the right has "nothing but tactics" (p. 153).

In early September, 1967, SUPA was dissolved[45] because "the early hopes for...a nation-wide movement of youth and the dispossessed for basic social change had never materialized, the organization...was in shambles, and new political perspectives were clearly needed (ibid, p. 6a). Bordo, Gray and the thirty-odd other SUPA members attending the September meeting recognized that SUPA's failure was related to its failure "to develop a coherent analysis of the structure of modern capitalism and its specific characteristics in Canada" (ibid, p. 6a). SUPA was reported to be "ideologically confused and uncritically eclectic" (ibid, p. 6a). SUPA, said the NLC, tended to "simplistically copy" radicals in other countries, particularly those in the USA "without regard to their relevance to Canada" (ibid, p. 6b). The adoption of "participatory democracy" was an example. The practice and rhetoric of "participatory democracy... mystified, frustrated, confused and disillusioned" youth. It "masked the fact that...it never went beyond liberalism"; it prevented the development of effective organization and a coherent program; it ensured that decisions were reached (when they were taken) "on the basis of the lowest common denominator"; and it paralyzed action (ibid, p. 6b). The NLC said SUPA failed to develop its own working analysis, and it neglected Canadian traditions and circumstances. Its propensity to accept American definitions of what constituted issues and appropriate action, its "isolation from and ignorance of working-class life", and its inability to develop an "integrated political strategy" which linked short term actions to long term goals, ensured that SUPA remained an isolated and ineffectual protest by middle-class youth "that corporate liberal society was not living up to its pretensions" (ibid p. 6b).

---

[45] The present discussion is based on an examination of SUPA and NLC documents. Of particular importance is the "statement of the New Left Committee — October, 1967" (The New Left Committee Bulletin, Vol. I, No. 1, October, 1967, p. 6a - 6c). This document is also printed in McGuigan (1968), 105 - 111.

> ...Isolated from socialist traditions, SUPA was side tracked by myths: the myth that revolutionary change can be a result of spontaneous popular rebellions, the myth that capitalism can be made to fulfill its liberal pretensions, the myth that radicals can ignore working class struggles and dismiss socialist perspectives (ibid, p. 6b).

Accordingly, the NLC resolved to undertake political and educational programs. Detailed studies of Canadian society, careful analyses of the social, economic, cultural, and political dimensions of monopoly capitalism, and theoretical work towards a "coherent strategy of social change" were to be undertaken along with "educational activities," the promotion of a "student syndicalist program" organizing projects, and the development of "better communication" between various groups (ibid, p. 6c). NLC members were therefore"mandated" to build a radical social movement through various educational strategies -- from participation in demonstrations to participation in "intensive study groups" (Roussopoulos, op. cit., p. 54), seminars, conferences and publications (New Left Committee Bulletin, I, 1, October 1967, p. 6c).

Bordo's activities at the University of Alberta during the 1968 - 1970 period, like those of Gray at McGill during the same period, were informed by political ideas and goals which go far beyond those which are apparent in the official "democratization of the universities" rhetoric espoused by the organization with whom he was commonly associated on campus. Bordo and his colleagues used issues to educate, to demystify, and to organize members of various on and off-campus groups. The objective was to build a movement which had purposes beyond mere educational "reform."

Although Price had some misgivings (Roussopoulos, op. cit., p. 56), SCM collaborated with SDU in a "collective" based on the Leninist (see Conquest, op. cit.) principle of "democratic centralism." The group's study and analysis of the local political economy and culture produced "the thesis of Alberta's being a satellite of capitalist imperialism" and the realization that this thesis provided "a framework in which to place all the phenomena that had been hitherto unrelated."[46] Apparently Price was impressed with the intellectual power of the neo-Leninist[47] analysis. He wrote (ibid, p. 54): "through this framework, things begin to fit into place." The products of the group's study were described by Price (ibid, p. 54 - 55) as follows:

> With the...direction of the economy determined by capital...held elsewhere...the role of the state is to develop the infrastructure of society and function as an administrator for the private sector. In the present situation in Alberta, political or ideological elements (with the exception of standard, ritualistic, free-enterprise bombast) are left out of legislative discussions, as the control of economic institutions is not only out of the hands of the people, but is also out of the hands of government. The need for an extra-parliamentary opposition

---

[46] Evidence of Bordo's previous experience and activities (e.g. his collaboration with Gray at McGill) suggests the hypothesis that he helped the SCM people "develop" a thesis which he had already accepted.

[47] Price (Roussopoulos, op. cit., p. 54) tells us that the group "coupled historical and recent research into the Alberta economy with the theoretical basis given in Lenin's Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism and C. B. MacPherson's...Democracy in Alberta..."

> thus takes on new dimensions. Even a social democratic party like the NDP could only exercise a holding operation in relation to foreign capital.
>
> Given this quasi-colonial status, the political-economic establishment in Alberta sees the role of the university as that of training people to respond to certain perceived requirements of the economy. But we must ask whose requirements... our educational system is serving...We see the class structure of society perpetuated at the university...
>
> With the above framework...the SDU plans to operate from an anti-imperialist stance in relation to both action and strategy. Student power issues will be left to...Student's Council, while SDU will perform...a vanguard role raising the...question of imperialism and authoritarianism in university structures...The SDU will engage in 'struggle journalism' through discussions with young farmers and workers...Through these sessions, alliances may develop...

This attention to and concentration of activity on off-campus groups may have accounted, in part, for the relatively small amount of turmoil on campus during the last two years of the decade. Unlike the political activists at Simon Fraser University, those at Edmonton appeared to have realized that a radicalized university population is impotent without significant off-campus support.

However, the activists at the University of Alberta did not ignore the campus completely. Executives of Students' Council[48] were hostile to CUS's social action policies[49] and succeeded in having the University of

---

[48] The work of Al Anderson, Branny Shepanovich, and Marilyn Pilkington, who were successive Presidents of the Council was directed against CUS's new social activism (e.g. see The Gateway, December 9, 14, 1966; March 7, 1967; September 25, 1967; September 11, 1968; The Peak, October 30, 1968).

[49] CUS had been moving from being a "service"-oriented organization to a body which emphasized social activism. CUS was undergoing a transformation which involved defining student interests in broader social terms. Accordingly, by the autumn of 1968, CUS had adopted an anti-

Alberta withdraw from CUS (see footnote 48). Furthermore, the ruling "rightists" appeared to help the administration "manage" and "co-opt" discontented students (e.g. see The Gateway, October 19, 1967; December 7, 1967; April 10, 1969). University officials had declared (The Gateway, September 11, 1968) that the university was "not an instrument for direct social or revolutionary actions" and it "must not be used for causes irrelevant to its academic purposes." Staff members and students were forbidden by policy of the Board of Governors "to use the university as an organization to support social change when they are concerning themselves with causes as individuals in society" (ibid). Further "if individuals or groups seek to impose their demands on the University as a whole or on any element in the University community, without regard for the due process of the law, prompt and decisive action must be taken..." (ibid). When The Gateway (September 11, 1968) attacked the President's "Conduct Memorandum" as an attempt to curb one group (the SDU), the Bordo-led group called a rally and published its own memorandum which declared that the university's role "always involved being an instrument for direct, usually counter-revolutionary action" (The Gateway, September 20, 1968). The only question was what sort of instrument and what sort of action? Bordo wrote that "it is in the duty of everyone in a class society to change its present class nature." If law interferes with this duty it must be changed or ignored; and university people must use their

---

capitalist, anti-imperialist position (The Gateway, September 11, 1968). The CUS Congress at Guelph, in 1968, declared that Canada was dominated by American imperialism and was, therefore, not self-determined. Furthermore, the universities were said to be "imperialist institutions". Accordingly, CUS advocated that students gain "control over the learning process" and university decision-making, help unionize university employees, make alliances with non-university groups, and work for "universal accessibility" to the university (ibid).

position or "class privilege" as "a means for achieving social justice both at the university and in society." For, social justice demands that change must come -- and at all times claims of justice take precedence over claims of law and order. The change could "hopefully" be peaceful -- but that was up to those who held power. With a nice sense of irony, Bordo said that the Board of Governors and Administration were "an unrepresentative minority" who impose their wishes on the majority: faculty, students and workers. This state of affairs was to be changed by the "counter impositions of the majority." The administration ("functionaries") would have to carry out the policy decisions of the majority. Worker (faculty, students, staff) control would replace that of the "business-administration-clique" (ibid, p. C4 - C5). The rally, attended by seven hundred people, was told by Christian Bay (The Gateway, September 24, 1968) that revolutionary action was needed because society can't cope; that "the university should be the agency to take care of this;" that students were oppressed; and that SDU should be encouraged for taking action for a more humane society in which professors and students would have "the say" at the university. Other speakers at the rally included Price and Bordo. The latter, after declaring that "for the university to change, society must also change" (ibid) made a seven point proposal. First, the Board of Governors was to be abolished and control was to be placed in the hands of students, faculty and the other workers. The second proposal was that students share control with faculty in framing curricula and hiring faculty. Third, students and faculty would define academic regulations while they would share the responsibility with other workers in framing non-academic rules. The fourth proposal called for "courses inquiring into the basic assumptions and operations of society" and the removal of barriers to the entrance of "exploited classes and races" to the university. The organization of non-academic staff into collective bargaining units was advocated as the fifth proposal. The sixth point called for a halt to all fee increases and the ultimate abolition of all fees. An evaluation of the adequacy of the physical plant and the institution of centralized planning were suggested by the final proposal (ibid).

At the end of the previous term (April, 1968), a raise in fees had been protested in marches on campus and the legislature. SDU had organized a petition of protest and the marches against the wishes of both the administration and the Students' Council (The Gateway, April 10, 1968). A "pamphlet war" between SDU and the Council (ibid) had followed organizational rallies in March (The Gateway, March 6, 1968). Accordingly, the autumn, 1968, activity of SDU on campus was a continuation of its struggle with the administration and, what the University President called "the properly constituted representatives of the students, viz, the Students' Council" (The Gateway, September 11, 1968, p. 5). Not surprisingly then, when the student President (Marilyn Pilkington) followed the SDU's September rally with a statement that there was no need for student power; that "we can work within the structure;" and that the Board of Governors deserved praise (The Gateway, October 4, 1968), SDU stepped up its harassment of Student Council (e.g. see The Gateway, September 26, 1968; October 4, 1968) and established "Counter-Education Groups" (Price, in Roussopoulos, op. cit., p. 44; The Gateway, October 22, 1968) which explored the proposals made by SDU at the September rally.

In November an "Arts Council Teach-In" was planned, even though it was disapproved of by Students' Council (The Gateway, November 26, 1968).

Student participation in decision making had become a popular cause which split faculty and students. The Gateway, possibly due to poor investigative procedures, represented the dispute in the Sociology Department as a dispute over this issue (ibid). Accordingly when activists (both faculty and students) dominated the Arts Council Teach-In and called for a march on the Sociology Department, 150 to 300 people marched to demand "democratization" of the department (The Gateway, December 3, 1968). When the misinformed character of the marchers became known (e.g. see The Gateway, December 6, 1968) SDU lost credibility in the eyes of many who associated the action with the organization.

After this episode, SDU activists concentrated their attention on off-campus groups to an increasing extent (e.g. see Price, in Roussopoulos, op. cit., p. 46 - 58). However, sporadic turmoil broke out from time to time when, for example, tenure disputes, such as that involving two sociology professors, became campus "issues" (ibid, p. 48) and when administrative practices which elicited suspicion were revealed (ibid, p. 49).[50] With these exceptions, leftist politics was left to club-invited speakers, pamphleteers, student journalists, and assorted party groups.

When the administration became more accommodating to student complaints and more progressive Students' Councils were elected, part of the SDU coalition focused its attention off-campus while other portions became absorbed in the fashion of "life-styles". The short-lived "groupuscules" which carried out sustained political activity eventually disintegrated.

---

[50] In the midst of a confrontation during "the Fisher-Whiteside tenure dispute" a Dean admitted that the university kept secret files on everyone there (ibid, p. 49).

While most of the turmoil at Edmonton during the 1960's was episodic, unsustained and based on liberal issues, in the later years of the decade a radical coalition which resembled the McGill leftists in its theoretical and behavioral characteristics, was involved in more sustained activism. This activism, which was informed by ideas and objectives which were more socialist than those of either of their predecessors or many of their contemporaries at such schools as SFU or Regina, became increasingly focused off-campus. These leftists apparently realized that student movements which remain student movements do not accomplish social change. Furthermore, at least some of them realized that notions like "participatory democracy" had to be critically examined and that they had to define what constituted problems and solutions for themselves.

Political Ideas and Activism

From the foregoing examination of turmoil at various campuses during the 1960's, one may conclude that some activists have assimilated matrices of political ideas which enable them to construe phenomena in their world in terms which differ or deviate from the constructions placed on the same phenomena by many -- probably most -- of their fellow citizens. One might say that their habits of representing, ordering and processing information of a socio-cultural sort are deviant. The recurrent patterns in which information is received, ordered, transformed and packaged by those who look at the world through socialist templets differ from the modal cognitive habits of the other citizens of the liberal state. In other words, students living in a liberal state may, in varying degrees acquire "habits of mind"[51] which enable them to perceive various arrangments, conditions and events which others find agreeable, as unpleasant. Their deviant consciousness and other cognitive habits enable them to connect these objectionable phenomena to their roots in the political economy of capitalism.[52] However, one may also conclude that some activists involved in turmoil, while critical of some condition, event or arrangement don't always connect the noxious phenomena to its roots. Furthermore, some activists never seem to make connections; they see problems as isolated or discrete and they deal with them as single issues. Accordingly, we find a variety of rationales for activism. Those guided by liberal ideas pursue the solution to a problem as an end in itself. Social problems are seen by the liberal as abberations which are unconnected. Each problem is amenable to treatment without changing the structural contradictions which create it. Socialists, on the other hand, tend to regard the same problem as parts of an organic whole, as connected to the structural characteristics of the political economy (Williams, op. cit., p. 17 - 18). Thus the socialist has a different strategy from the liberal in dealing with a given issue. This socialist strategy was that which Bordo at Alberta, Gray at McGill, Harding at Regina, and Loney and Yandle at SFU employed. Reamsbottom of SUPA (SUPA Newsletter, vol. III, No. 10, August, 1967, p. 19) described his version of the strategy as follows:

---

[51] Acquisition is likely dependent upon such factors as division of labour, the degree of removal from the forces of production, the reinforcement of critical habits of thought, tradition, accessibility to socialist ideas, and the reinforcement of the use of such ideas. (Note: "Habits of mind" were discussed in Chapter III (above)). For present purposes one

---

might consider the following to be among the subordinate categories of the superordinate category "habits of mind": habits of orientation (e.g. interests); habits of criticism; habits of abstraction and representation (ideas or concepts).

[52] This latter habit -- that of making connections, of looking for the roots of problems in "the base", in the distribution of wealth and power, in the mode of production -- is not part of a liberal's cognitive repertoire or "habits of mind."

> We know the strategy: dislocation through direct action followed by radical education. After one has developed an intuitive understanding that there are 'evils' in our society and has begun to formulate a political analysis, he chooses the 'radical' way.[53]

Although this is a crude formulation one thing is clear: issues are sometimes used for political education by socialists. They are not ends in themselves. Again, Harding (SUPA Newsletter, vol. II, No. 11, October 5, 1966, p. 18) makes this explicit:

> ...I would suggest that radicals trying to organize people against welfare capitalism and for the non-violent socialist society...first engage in social dislocation (through direct action); then, once the control of people by liberal ideology is lessening (they are having doubts because of the dislocation), engage in a radical education;...

Since the liberal activist does not, by definition, reject the legitimacy, viability and worth of the entire economic system, his extra-parliamentary activism may be regarded as public lobbying for adjustments within the system with respect to particular complaints. In contrast, the left-socialist or radical rejects the viability, worth, and legitimacy of the entire political and economic system of monopoly capitalism because he perceives the relation of components to the organic whole. The socialist makes connections and sometimes endeavors to help others discover the same connections.

When a person realizes that work, interpersonal, international and all other relations are structured by an economic system that brutalizes man, all social transactions within that system may be perceived in political terms. All actions or inaction may be evaluated as either serving the status quo or undermining it. Accordingly, educational processes, personnel, materials and institutions may be perceived as political in nature. Virtually everything encountered by a person who views reality through this matrix of ideas is a political issue.

---

[53] One of the problems with this crude formulation is that many defined the "evil" in society as those who "disrupted" it. More sophisticated leftists "help" people "choose" by "assisting" them to "discover" certain ideas or "ideological tools." That is, they make information and analysis available (e.g. see Stewart, op. cit., p. 50).

Armed with a leftist picture of reality and concepts like "mystification", "false consciousness" and "praxis", as well as knowledge of the relation of social being to consciousness, a leftist may believe that he understands why most people around him do not perceive the world as he does. He may then set out to "demystify", educate or "politicize" them by choosing an issue which has some immediate impact on his target population.[54] The people may be organized to make demands that the system is incapable of meeting (e.g. primary or direct democracy). The objective of this ploy may be to "demystify" the people with respect to the illusions they have about liberal democracy and the benificence of the system; or it may be to force an escalation of activity when, with each instance of frustration, the leftist provides analyses and theory as to the reasons for the lack of success for their efforts.

On the other hand, the leftist might choose an adversary whose function violates a sacred value of the target population and which violation is connected with aiding some odious off-campus interest. One of the objectives of such a choice might be that the non-radicals will "learn to make connections." This might be assumed to follow from "discovery" of the connection between university officials behavior and the off-campus party's interests during the confrontation with the adversary. In addition, the probability of gaining some goal with respect to the campus issue might be considered as well, so as to associate positive results with confrontation politics. However, failure to obtain the desired results, or repression as an institutional response would be represented as evidence of collusion between the agency, which was the chosen adversary, and the odious interest. The agency, it might be said, places the interests of the off-campus associate above those of the students.

---

[54] Available evidence suggests that this is what Gray did in Quebec and Bordo did at Edmonton.

In short, people with leftist consciousness may systematically set out to increase their numbers by using issues supplied by the status quo and its agents as opportunities for teaching non-radicals. However, as we have seen (e.g. at SFU) those who subscribe to socialist ideas are not always successful in their "teaching". Nor do they always succeed in transforming single issues into general campaigns.

Persons who assimilate socialist ideas which enable them to make connections between (i.e. integrate) the phenomena of their world while they still live in a liberal culture and state, are subject to liberal influences. Even the thoughts of Marx, one of the most coherent of socialist thinkers, were affected by his "social being." The mark of the Enlightenment is on Marx. In his early writings we see the liberal ideology of self-actualization. Indeed, one may suggest that his theory of social change bears within it a variant of a major liberal tenet of his day: this was a "faith" in the "inevitability of progress." Furthermore, as Horowitz[55] suggests, socialism and liberalism have a common element: as an ideology, socialism "combines the corporate-organic-collectivist ideas of toryism with the rationalist-egalitarian ideas of liberalism (p. 143 - 144)." Accordingly, people whose consciousness is formed in a liberal society, are subject to seduction by certain liberal ideas, especially those expressing rationalist or egalitarian sentiments, even though they may have assimilated socialist ideas and acquired the rudiments of a socialist mentality or consciousness and in spite of the fact that socialist conceptions of equality and rationalism are significantly different from their liberal counterparts.[56]

---

[55] G. Horowitz, "Conservatism, liberalism, and socialism in Canada: an interpretation", The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXXII, 2, May, 1966, 143 - 171.

Accordingly, some leftist activists used liberal issues for building a larger movement while others regarded liberal ideals, such as primary democracy, as compatible with their goal of making a socialist egalitarian society. We saw the former at McGill and the latter at SFU.

While the present writer suspects that primary democracy became an end-in-itself for many at SFU and other places, some writers claim the matter is not always clear cut. For example, Halliday (op. cit., in Cockburn and Blackburn, p. 322 - 323) argued that

---

[56] As Horowitz (ibid) writes, "socialists disagree with liberals about the essential meaning of equality because socialists have a tory conception of society." The "liberal view of equality (equality of opportunity)" is found to be inadequate by socialists because "all are not equal in the pursuit of individual happiness." Accordingly, socialists think of society as a "community of classes rather than an aggregation of individuals" and demand "equality of condition rather than mere equality of opportunity... cooperation rather than competition...(and) a community that does more than provide a context within which individuals can pursue happiness in a purely self-regarding way." (In addition, see Sedgewick, op. cit.).

Socialist conceptions, especially the Marxian conceptions, of rationalism differ most remarkably from classical liberal notions, in that the "rational" function is regarded as a determined product -- a social product. Socialist conceptions lack the underlying free-will which liberal conceptions of rationality seem to incorporate. For Marx "the phantoms of the human brain...are necessary sublimates of man's material life-process, which can be empirically established and which is bound to material preconditions...(and)...no longer retain...their appearance of autonomous existence." Ideas, rationality, conceptions, imagination, morality, metaphysics and all "other ideologies" are "reflexes" conditioned through each man's material intercourse (Bottomore and Rubel, op. cit., p. 70).

> the relationship between educational and political issues is a dialectical one...In many countries there has been an initial build-up of militancy on academic issues, which...then escalated into a struggle on political issues. The Cordoba Movement in Latin America, which later developed into revolutionary solidarity with guerilla struggles, is an eloquent example...Thus it is absolutely incorrect to counterpose educational to political demands...Experience shows that the one often naturally develops into the other...There are also examples where an initially political campaign by students repercusses back into the campus and detonates an internal revolt within higher education. In the United States it was the political experience of the Civil Rights campaigns and demonstrations against the Vietnamese and Dominican Expeditions which produced explosion at Berkeley.

Nevertheless, although larger campaigns or a movement may grow out of campus turmoil "naturally," the examples which we have examined above suggest that larger movements do not always grow naturally out of campus turmoil. In fact the only campus turmoil in the present sample which did meld into a larger movement was planned and engineered to do just that. (This was the turmoil in which the Quebec syndicalists were involved).

Accordingly, one can distinguish between the ideas and tactical activism of revolutionary vanguardists and the ideas and activism of reformists or liberals. What is more difficult to explain in terms of relating ideas to activism is the activism of people whose rhetoric suggests revolutionary goals but whose other behavior is reformist even though reformism is rejected as futile in their utterances.

Psychologists like Heider[57] and sociologists such as Blackburn

(1969, p. 199 - 201) have demonstrated that people in capitalist societies have fragmented consciousness which enables them to hold inconsistent or incompatible attitudes, beliefs, world views, or ideas "at the same time." In different situations or contexts, opposing ideas, attitudes or beliefs are expressed by the same person. Thus SFU's PSA activists like Conway, acknowledged that the distribution of power and the relations of production in political economy proscribed what could be done at the University and even in Parliament. Conway also acknowledged that the realities of power distribution under capitalism made political struggle in all sectors of society imperative because only a mass movement so forged could have any chance of radically altering the power distribution and relations of production inherent in capitalism (The Peak, January 22, 1969, p. 5). However, Conway and his fellow activists' behavior and other utterances could move a sympathetic observer to make the following observations (The Peak, October 9, 1968):

> ...go to work. Tell everyone you work with that you are a university student. Count how many of them say they are so glad to be around educated people. Bet you won't even need grade one to do that!
>
> Now tell them that you are different from most students, that you are a radical and are on the side of the workers. Chances are you will be told you are full of shit.
>
> Chances are it's true.
>
> Simon Fraser University seems to be breeding a strange new kind of 'radical.' This rare revolutionary never looks further than the University grounds. He spends hundreds of hours...watching and denouncing the activities of administrative committees and...faculty...

---

[57] See A. L. Baldwin, Theories of Child Development. New York: John Wiley, 1968, p. 5 - 83.

> Always vigilant, he pounces on every chance to demonstrate how undemocratic the faculty are... This is all legitimately part of a battle to gain more control for the student. But control for what? Why is it important that students control the University? We have already experienced student...politicians who are indistinguishable from the Strands (The President of SFU) etc.
>
> Will student parity in running the university simply mean another series of meaningless choices...?
>
> ...Student power people...are too busy playing the campus political game...
>
> ...Are they also interested in more power for old people...poor families...?
>
> If students were to organize with other...people in the city to do something about the housing shortage (for example) they would also be doing something to remove the idea most workers have that students are all spoiled kids who plan to become plant managers or useless academics.
>
> ...Control of the University without...a commitment to fight for social justice within (the larger society)...is an empty achievement.
>
> No student in his right mind would risk his... studies for a voice on an administrative body that has no effect outside the university...
>
> ...Student representation will always remain tokenism, even though the students run the university entirely by themselves.
>
> For (student activists) have no...concept of the university's role in society and...no policy towards (sic) those who will still control it, as they do now, financially.

Conway could argue (The Peak, March 12, 1969, p. 7 - 9) that control of the university must be "wrested from...corporate capitalism" and that "we cannot have independent universities without independent economic and political instituitons." However, at the same time as he deplores the fact that American capital's domination of Canadian cultural life has been so pervasive that Canadians are now merely an echo of American expression, Conway would change all of this by "restructuring" universities so that the Americanized faculty and students would control the universities -- "the most vital...cultural institution any modern society possesses"! Apparently, activists like Conway can at once carry out a socialist analysis and at the same time reify an abstract liberal principle like "participatory democracy." Somehow, those who had been "conditioned" to accept, vote for and defend the culture of capitalism would suddenly reject it, if the university were democratized. This would occur even though the "economic control" which Conway (ibid, p. 7) asserted "must inevitably assert itself in our political and cultural institutions" would obviously not be changed by merely installing primary democracy in the university!

Available evidence suggests that Conway and other activists at SFU wanted to install participatory democracy at SFU in order that students could "teach" themselves "the art of governing" themselves, "of making the rational, responsible decisions so long removed" from them[58] (The Peak, September 27, 1967). In other words, they sought autonomy -- freedom from external sanction. As Harding expressed the notion (The Peak, May 31, 1968), activists demanded "democratization" so that "personal liberation from external sanctions" would enable each person to realize his full "human potential." Accordingly, one may conclude that the traditional liberal ideology of self-actualization through the unfettered, autonomous exercise of individual initiative was an end-in-itself for some of the activists who espoused socialist ideas.

---

[58] After PSA had installed its parity system, some faculty members in PSA reported that "less than 8% of the students attended the meetings and "a dozen members of a student elite" actually "formulated and carried out" policy (The Peak, August 1, 1969, p. 5). Apparently, only a few were interested in learning how to govern themselves.

Schwietzer and Elden (1971) were impressed by the similarity of New Left conceptions of "participatory democracy" and liberalism's traditional ideals as expressed by the American Right. Their study of an American sample revealed that "the New Left would have a form of government" which enhanced "a new sense of individual autonomy and self-determination," based on "higher levels of self-actualization and creative expression" (p. 162 - 163). The researchers suggested that the inherent anarchic quality in the New Left's conception of participatory democracy "points toward the very structure of a nineteenth century laissez-faire brand of social organization which permeates much of the Right's traditional rhetoric" (p. 161). These conclusions may not be inappropriate with respect to the ideas of Conway at SFU, Price at Alberta, Wilson at McGill and Uhl at Regina. Indeed, as we shall see in the following chapter, the notion that students should be free to follow their own inclinations, was so widely disseminated and accepted that it may have been more important insofar as ideas were functionally related to activism and turmoil, than the socialist political ideas which received our attention in this chapter.

Ideas, Arousal and Behavior

Before turning our attention to dimensions of mass culture which the present writer associates with some activism, a return to a question raised in Chapter II is in order. That is, how does one relate or link ideas to motivation? How are ideology and action to be linked?

In Chapter II, evidence was presented which suggested that political activists shared a constellation of attributes which distinguished them from non-activists. However, other evidence and argument was presented which indicated that some people who were non-activists shared these attributes. Accordingly, the hypothesis that differential acculturation may have accounted for this fact was considered. Flacks (op. cit.) and Keniston (op. cit.) both presented evidence that activists learn ideas from their parents, which ideas are progressive or leftist. That is, activists assimilate ideas which are critical of socio-cultural arrangements. Since much evidence exists which supports the cultural continuity notion (e.g. Thomas, op. cit.), our problem is in part, to explain how the assimilation of critical ideas can be related to activism.

Kelly (op. cit.) reminds us that man looks at the world through constructs and attempts to fit them over the realities of the world. "Because he can represent his environment he can place alternative constructions upon...it"(p. 8). Accordingly, one's stock of ideas define the variety and shape reality can be given. However, since the "essence of perception is selective attention to something important" and "each age...and culture has its way of selecting what is important to see"[59] the individual's perceptions are dependent upon the stock of ideas which he has incorporated from the stock of his verbal community.[60] The individual perceives the world, then, in terms of ideas he has acquired from others. Through these ideas his feelings, as well as the external realities, are ordered.[61] Thus, different people can see the same event, condition or arrangement as different realities and therefore have different feelings about the event, condition or arrangement. For example, a person may perceive an object in his path. The object may be perceived as a rope or a snake -- even if it is neither. If the object is perceived as "rope" little emotion, affect or arousal would accompany the perception. However, if the stimulus object is perceived as "snake," a relatively high arousal response might be expected. Since "there is considerable evidence that emotional arousal results in increased intensity of responding" (Walters and Parke, 1964, p. 236) the person perceiving the object as "snake" would probably respond in a more animated fashion than the person perceiving the object as "rope" (Geen and O'Neal, 1969). For the same reasons instances of social, political, economic, and other cultural phenomena can be construed and responded to differently, as a consequence of the accessibility of ideas. For example, one person may categorize a particular international arrangement as an instance of imperialism, while another person would not, due to his lack of pertinent ideas. The latter might identify the international arrangement in question as an exemplar of "international cooperation". Accordingly, the two observers do not share a common denotative meaning for the arrangement which is common to their observation.

---

[59] J. J. Gibson. "Pictures, perspectives and perception," Daedalus, 1960, 13, 216 - 229.

[60] C. C. Anderson. "Psychological contributions to education: the origin and modification of values," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XI, 4, December, 1965, 203 - 214.

[61] A. R. Luria. "The role of speech in the formation of temporary connections and the regulation of behavior in the normal and oligophrenic child" In B. Simon and S. Simon (eds.). Educational Psychology in the U.S.S.R. London: Routledge, 1963, p. 83 - 97.

Nor are the affective meanings -- the emotional responses of the two persons -- likely to be similar. "Imperialism" would probably have connotations which include feelings of unpleasantness. "Cooperation" might well have less negative affect attached to its meaning. Studies such as those carried out by Brewer and Brewer[62], Osgood[63], and Staats and Staats[64] suggest that words or objects acquire evaluative meaning through repeated association with value-laden concepts. Apparently, not only are affective predispositions toward a phenomenon produced through repeated associations of the label and the object, event or whatever; but they are also produced when the phenomenon's sign if consistently used in connection with value-laden terms even in the absence of direct contact with the referrent object, event, condition or arrangement. Cauthen et. al. (op. cit.) in their study of stereotypes illustrates how stable such responses can be. The researchers found that patterns of verbal associations with and affective meanings of social stereotypes of ethnic groups were remarkably persistent over forty years. Mediating responses linked to one sign are apparently transferred to other signs which are associated with the sign in the context of phrases or sentences. Furthermore, the conditioned meaning, can be generalized to the referrent object associated with the sign. Accordingly, to return to our example, the association of "imperialism" with such words as "war," "exploitation," and the like would probably produce negative feelings, while the association of "international cooperation" with "aid," "assistance" and so forth would probably have a very different effect. In summary, ideas may produce arousal which in turn may produce "intense" responses such as attacks on exemplars of the phenomenon to which negative affective meaning has been conditioned (Berkowitz, 1972, p. 96).

---

[62] R. E. Brewer and M. B. Brewer, "Expressed evaluation toward a social object as a function of label" Journal of Social Psychology, 84, August, 1971, 257 - 260.

[63] C. Osgood, "The nature and measurement of meaning" Psychological Bulletin, 49, 1952, 197 - 237.

However, since adaptation to noxious objects or events may take the form of attack or withdrawal (Skinner, 1971, op. cit.) the possession of ideas or ideology by itself does not appear to account for the motivation of political activism. Accordingly, this matter is raised again in the context of an exploration of social learning variables and activism (Chapters V and VI).

---

[64] C. Staats and A. Staats, "Meaning established by classical conditioning." Journal of Experimental Psychology, 54, 1957.

Meanwhile turmoil which does not appear to have direct connections with the sort of political ideas which were discussed in the present chapter, is the subject which is explored in the following pages. Since the present writer perceives connections between the character of the political economy which produces consumer or mass culture and this particular proportion of the turmoil, the following chapter begins with an exploration of some of the characteristics of the consumer economy and its values and mass culture which we find in contemporary neo-capitalist societies. The subsequent examination of how these characteristics may be connected to non-political turmoil in the schools is placed within the framework of an encompassing cultural context. This framework includes that which the present writer and others perceive to be the dynamics of the political economy which tend to debilitate and debase intellect, politics and culture in general. In other words, the disruption and paralysis of teaching and learning by non-political and even anti-political activists is portrayed as one consequence of, and as only one expression of, a set of arrangements, conditions and transactions which are regarded as being inherent in the political economy of neo-capitalism and which tend to sacrifice or destroy anything in the name of youth, progress, creativity, growth, freedom, values, self-actualization or whatever else helps to aggrandize business. These characteristics of this economic and cultural dynamic then, are presently perceived to be significant factors which contributed to the popularization, depoliticization and eventual decline of activism in the schools. Accordingly, we now turn to an analysis of neo-capitalism's mass culture and its values.

CHAPTER V

MASS CULTURE AND TURMOIL

The Cultural Context: Mass Culture and Values

Hannah Arendt (1971) has suggested that culture or any element within it, begins to be called a "value"[1] when it becomes a "social commodity" which can be "cashed in on". Arendt (ibid, p.96) contended that cultural phenomena are "transformed into values when the cultural philistine [seizes] upon them as a currency by which he [can buy] a higher position in society..." Accordingly, the basis for profitable business arises. Cultural phenomena which are called "values" or "valuable" can be marketed as commodities. Through these means cultural "values" are exchanged on a massive scale. They are, then, "...what values have always been, exchange values"; and, in the exchange process they are transformed, ... "worn down like an old coin" (ibid, p.96). The "cultural value" becomes popularized by the instruments (and for growth benefits and profits) of the market economy's entertainment and other industries. However, in the process the culture is vandalized and debased; serious matters are trivialized and made vulgar:

> entertainment industry's mass media ransack the entire range of past and present culture for

---

[1] "Values" are frequently taken to be abstractions: categories of thought which are "conceptions of the desirable". (C.C. Anderson, Psychological contributions to education: The origin and modification of values" Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XI, 4, December, 1965, p.203). However, if the referents for the abstractions -- "the sort of objects, conditions or events which are reinforcing to man, either immediately or in the long run" (ibid) -- are defined as values, advantages of operational definition and parsimony are accrued. Accordingly, for present purposes, the latter definition is more useful.

> material which is transformed so as to become entertaining...the transformations include the re-written, condensed, digested...kitsch.
>
> ...What we call mass culture is what we ought more accurately to call the decay of culture in mass society. This decay sets in when liberties are taken with cultural objects in order that they may be distributed among masses of people (ibid, p.98).

Criticism in Mass Culture: The 'Value' of Criticism and the Costs

In these circumstances the durable art and learning normally thought to embody "high culture" (Rosenberg, 1971, p.9) is threatened. For, the exchange market of consumer society is anti-cultural: "...it spells ruin to everything it touches" (Arendt, op.cit., p.100). And since anything is fair game for commercial exploitation, works of excellence and standards of excellence are placed in jeopardy. Standards, distinctions, discrimination, discipline and intellectual functions generally fall before the formidable apparatus assembled and utilized in contemporary corporate operations. Accordingly, scientific technology (e.g. in mass communications media), philanthropy (e.g. the seller's flattering attribution of freedom, equality, perfectability and limitless potential to all men), combined with the trapplings of art (e.g. layout, style and so on), have been referred to as the "enemies of intellect" (Barzun, 1961) since they are used in commerce to vulgarize everything. (MacDonald; in Casty, 1968, 12-24).

Values and Fashion and The Weakening of the Moral Force of Intellect

In consumer society, cultural criticism, "the chief business" of intellect (Barzun, op.cit., p.261) is subjected to and made impotent by an economy of values based on fashion:

> ...Even the avant-garde has to live and work in the present, accept compromises and adjustments, reconcile itself with the official culture of the times, and

> collaborate with at least some part of the public. These adjustments...compromises, reconciliations and collaborations, are also reciprocal and are rendered necessary by the intervention of a powerful factor, fashion...
>
> The chief characteristic of fashion is to impose and to suddenly accept as a new rule or norm what was, until a minute before, an exception..., then to abandon it again after it has become a commonplace, everybody's thing. Fashion's task, in brief, is to maintain a continual process of standardization: putting a rarity...into general and universal use, then passing on to another rarity or novelty when the first has ceased to be such...Fashion tends to translate a new or strange form into acceptable and imitatable...'stereotype'. (Poggioli, 1971, pp.79-80).

Birnbaum (1970) has observed that when a culture is industrialized, avant-garde activity can be (and is) marketed as "spectator sport" (p.144). Whether marketing transforms "tendencies in avant-garde culture...into popular or semi-popular", spectator or participatory sport (or some other form of entertainment) one can, like Birnbaum (ibid, p.144), take the process as "evidence for the irrelevance of avant-garde effort" (also see Hofstadter, 1963, p.418). No criticism, whether it be embodied in art or politics or the disciplined revision of a body of knowledge is strong enough to withstand vulgarization (Rosenberg, 1964, p.5). In commercial culture, everything that is not understood or remediable must be transformed so that it is effortlessly understood or remediated (ibid). Condensations, digests, stereotypes and devices such as those Barzun (op.cit., pp.51-55) called "thought cliches"[2] are utilized for these purposes. The debased ideas they represent are then used for marketing, e.g., in the "knowledge industry", which might more properly be called the "information" or "explanations industry". Accordingly, sociology has emerged as a part of popular (i.e. mass) culture (see Gouldner, 1971, pp.4-6). The mass circulation of periodicals like Popular

Psychology can be taken as evidence that "pop soc" has company in "mid-cult-mass-culture" in the form of "pop psych". The press and electronic media treatments of politics, economics and education suggest that a "pop pol", a "pop ec", and a "pop ed crit" (Greene, 1973) bedevil those who are affected by serious and other sorts of contributions to the fields in question. This process has, in Trachtenberg's (1971) words, "popularized and cheapened" the idea of cultural change (p.128).

The Marketing of "Revolution"

Fragments and phrases from McLuhan and Marcuse, and slogans from newsworthy and otherwise exploitable but serious and erudite activists, were appropriated, isolated, juxtaposed with trivia and otherwise exhausted of their remnants of meaning, through their use in commerical fashion (e.g. in Hollywood, "now" movies like 'RPM*') during the past decade (Sayre, 1974, e.g. 72-86). As turmoil became commonplace, the fashionable phrases served in lieu of analysis for both the mass media and many of the

---

[2] "The thought cliché is an idea or a phrase contrary to fact which is clung to because it sounds familiar and feeds a half-attentive wish for thought...Because it looks plausible...correction sounds pedantic...It is deliberately contrived to spare the reader the effort of learning something new...Another and a subtler intention is to afford the pleasure of recognition and earn the gratitude that goes with it... The thought cliche does more than misinform; it weakens attention, curiosity and the critical sense. Where all is familiar, nothing arrests gliding and starts thought. And smooth progress permits any group of words, provided they are recognizable, to 'explain' almost any situation." (Barzun, 1961, 51-54). Examples of terms which are currently used with great frequency as thought clichés are: radical, revolutionary, extremist, terrorist, Marxist, moderate, responsible, wormen's lib, freedom, democracy, totalitarian, manipulation, alienation, creativity, natural (e.g. see R. Thompson "PSA Crisis: Part of a Trend", The Ubyssey, October 24, 1969, p.24; The New York Times Magazine, April 4, 1971, p.2).

*Among the "now" movies which were produced Sayre (1974) listed "The Activist", "Getting Straight", "The Strawberry Statement", "RPM", and "Woodstock". The spectacle reminded Sayre that Graham Greene had said in 1935 that 'There's always money to be picked up in a revolution" (p.73).

more recently activated pupils. An increasing incidence of activism and the coincident debasement of its ideology made radicalism both attractive for and susceptible to mass media exploitation. According to Trachtenburg (ibid., p.128) the exploitation was "blatant" and thorough. "Mind-blowing" became "a major industry".[3] This, in turn, spread a set of debased ideas about social change. For example, the belief that changes in hair style, in dress, in argot, in sexual behavior, drug usage and schooling constitute a rejection of the social order, and a preparation and instrument for revolution, became faddish. The mass media could readily associate honorific and attractive images and loaded but empty words with the "fashions" sold as the indispensable "values" of a "revolutionary" life "style". Companies hired "house hippies" to sell their wares (Kopkind, 1974). "Hip capitalism" paid off. Thus Trachtenburg (ibid.) could describe the irony in the supposedly "new style" which was advertised as being "more 'authentic'":

> The fact that it is also fashionable does not seem to occur to its defenders...Revolution has come to mean something dangerously close to sheer impulse...Is the 'American Way' really in danger from such gestures? The fact is that the 'American Way' itself has cultivated these impulses, has set them up as its...version of what it means to be 'different'...The fantastic notion that if only the 'up-tight' middle-class would 'turn-on', war and proverty would cease, the air would de-pollute itself, and capitalism self-destruct has become a pleasant fantasy and...a piece of vicarious entertainment for the middle-class itself (ibid, pp.128-129).

---

[3] e.g., see J. Kazickas "The new, young capitalists: getting rich on their own terms" The New York Times, April 12, 1971, p.74 and Craig Pyes "The Rolling Stone gathers moss...money" The Los Angeles Free Press, March 19, 1971, pp.5, 9, 15. (This latter article describes how one publication promotes and profits from 'rock as rebellion' -- the "economism of the guitar" e.g. the belief that music can cure the world of its ills.).

In these circumstances simple, isolated slogans and catch-words like "participation", "freedom", "individuality", "creativity", "revolution" and "innovation" filled the air. In addition, mass media people and others profited from this vapid flow (Sayre, 1974, 72-73).[4]

The Profitability of Change-Making

Of course, liberal capital has traditionally placed a high premium on scientific and technological creativity innovation and reform. Since criticism is a sine qua non of innovation and reform, its "value" to the liberal economy and state has been readily apparent to at least some members of the owning class. For reform and innovation in both state and industry was regarded by elements in the owning class, from at least the early nineteenth century, as a means of retaining and enhancing the value of their possessions and reducing the power of the radical critics. As a consequence, an expert on motivation in advertising could eventually write: "we have institutionalized change and innovation as part of our American way of life" (Martineau, 1971, p.162). Similarly, a thoughtful educator could observe that "what Americans call education innovation turns out with uncanny frequency to be 'reform entrepreneurship' or saleable, marketable, profitable but usually ineffectual techniques to forestall ethnic and class warfare" (Featherstone, 1972, p.29).[5] As industrialization proceeded, adjustments had to be made to both assist the process and accommodate its economic, political and social effects. In this situation, intellectual labour had value. Accordingly, criticism and reform were formalized, professionalized, and isolated (in professional enclaves and forums, e.g. legislatures).[6] By these means, the criticisms of dissidents could be anticipated and/or the dissenters themselves along with their ideas could be put to use in the service of the liberals' interests (e.g. as professional critics and academics). If critical work could be made attractive, criticism could be purchased and dissidents co-opted, trouble-spots and weaknesses within the system could be identified and treated through reforms. In the bargain, the hegemony of property could be preserved. (Levich, 1971; Marcuse, 1964, chs. IV-VII; 1969, ch. VI; Wolff, Moore, Marcuse, 1969).

---

[4] See J. Kazickas "The new young capitalists getting rich on their own terms" The New York Times, April 18, 1971, p.74; Craig Pyes "The Rolling Stone gathers moss...and money" The Los Angeles Free Press, March 19, 1971, p.5, 9, 15; and P. Nobile (ed.) The Con III Controversy, Simon and Schuster (Pocket), 1971, e.g. pp.189-194.

[5] See The New York Times: "100-million Ford grant to aid minority education", October 10, 1971, p.1; "Turmoil over local control", December 3, 1972, p.E5; "Frustration at John Dewey High School", December 10, 1972, p.E5; and "Program that flunked", ibid., and Featherstone, 1972, p.29.

Hacker (1970) and Persons (1973) have described how the ranks of learned professions were swelled when the advantages and benefits of membership were seen as an improvement on the conditions of life and work that were endured by most people in the U.S.A. Education was assumed, mistakenly (see Jencks, 1972) to be the great equalizer.[7] But some, of course, could and did acquire a lot which was more comfortable than that of their parents and the modal condition of people generally (see Hacker, op.cit.,; Persons, op.cit.). These "success stories" (often used as such in mass media) seemingly demonstrated the validity of the myth. Accordingly, those who "arrived" could sell their critical services to maintain their gains, and the myth that all are equal and everyone can win in a competitive system. Thus, professional ranks may have served as a buffer between owners and less privileged workers as the latter worked to acquire the benefits and status of the more privileged servants -- the professionals whose advantages and functions are often related to the control of the many, less privileged servants. (Some of the more sophisticated activists, e.g. see Cockburn and Blackburn, 1969, op.cit., regarded university professors and other professionals as modern equivalents of Plato's guardians in that their selection, preparation and management of students allegedly made students into ideal servants for the owners or rulers -- in the manner of Plato's artisans).

---

[6] R. Ohmann, To reform the academy, Saturday Review, July 17, 1971, 54-55.

[7] The references to equality in American circumstances were (and still are) characteristically associated with the notion of "opportunity". However, T.B. Bottomore (Elites and Soceity, Penguin, 1966, p.148) has argued that the idea of "equality of opportunity" as the expression is habitually used, presupposes inequality since "opportunity" means the opportunity to rise above others in a class society while simultaneously, it presupposes equality, since it implies that the inequalities embedded in class society have to be counteracted. "Equality of opportunity could only become a reality in a society without classes...and the notion itself would then be otiose..." (p.149). (W.H. Mallock had, in 1917 (The Limits of Pure Democracy) shown how the notion of "equality of opportunity" was both conservative and self contradictory). (See Williams, 1963, pp.168-169).

students for the owners or rulers -- in the manner of Plato's artisans).

Propaganda and Managing Change

By the time innovation in industrial processes made new mass media available, the industrial system had created conditions which required a literate mass. The "necessity" for "propaganda"[8] had been created (Ellul, 1973, see "Preface"; 118-147; 182-187): The state needed propaganda to govern; the owners needed it to manage labour and market; the individual needed it to "face his condition".

---

[8] Ellul (op.cit., p.61) defined propaganda as "...a set of methods employed by an organized group that wants to bring about the active or passive participation in its actions of a mass of individuals, psychologically unified through psychological manipulations and incorporated in an organization." Ellul (ibid, pp.52-53) insisted that the popular assumption that propaganda necessarily involves lying is not only inaccurate but misleading as well: "For a long time propagandists have recognized that lying must be avoided. 'In propaganda truth pays off...." Obviously truth or facts can be used in many different ways for different ends.

Ellul (ibid.) argued that modern man is in the position of needing outside help (ibid. p.138) since the complexity of life presents him with the necessity for making decisions on matters about which he is ignorant (also see Birnbaum, 1970, p.161):

> Besides...developments are not merely beyond man's intellectual scope; they are also beyond him in volume and intensity; he simply cannot grasp the world's economic and political problems. Faced with such matters he feels his weakness...his lack of effectiveness...He depends on decisions over which he has no control...Man cannot stay in this situation too long. He needs a...veil to cover the harsh reality, some consolation...and...propaganda offers him a remedy...(Ellul, op.cit., p.140).

Mass Media, the Illusion Industry: The Making of Popular Opinion and Values

Mass media provide both the "explanations" and some of the subject matter that needs to be explained. "News", daily created, selected and presented according to formulae, (e.g. see Boorstin, 1964, Ch. I; Brown, 1971, p.363; Schramm in Casty, 1968, pp.168-171) creates a need for explanations; and "analysis", "serious" commentary, advice columns, "public affairs" programs, "pop psych" and the like furnish the "explanations" and "answers" which give a semblance of order and coherence to the myriad of detail (Ellul, op.cit.). At the same time self-images and self-justifications are donated (Vidich and Bensman, 1968); social, political and moral standards are codified; ideas are standardized; categories, thought patterns and opinions are supplied; collective beliefs are formed; stereotypes and prejudices are hardened; fashions are created; and values are sold (Ellul, op.cit., e.g. p.163). Among the values peddled are popular opinions and criticisms which are also used to sell other values from soap to entertainment (Smythe, 1968).[9] In short, ubiquitous mass media create a common sense of what comprises "common sense" (Gorz, 1968; Mills, 1956; van den Haag, 1968) and reinforce what Ortega (*op.cit.*, Ch. I) suggested was mass man's absurd assumption that uncommon sense is necessarily inferior to the common variety. Gorz (*op. cit.*), who by no means shared many of Ortega's views, nevertheless observed that:

> Mass culture, a by-product of commercial propaganda, has an implicit content a mass ethic -- playing on, maintaining and flattering ignorance, it encourages the ignorant to resent those who 'know', persuades them that the latter despise them, and encourages or provokes their contempt. This abject demagogery, one of whose elements [is] contempt for 'intellectuals'...and for culture...professes no respect for exceptional individuals except insofar as their superiority can be accounted for by what they *are*, not by what they *do*...(p.118).

Those who flatter the ignorant, together with athletes, beauty queens, and assorted other celebrities or heroes, comprise a "vicarious aristocracy" with whom bonds of community are reinforced in the mass man's fantasies by the "demagogy of levelling". According to Gorz (*ibid*, p.119) this substitute for genuine community "begins as business and ends as politics":

> ...In order to sell newspapers, radio time, or advertising space, one begins by flattering superstition and lulling reason, by emphasizing myths rather than facts, sensational rather than significant things; one prefabricates individuality in order to sell some of it to individuals whose own individuality one has destroyed (and which one destroys further by this forced sale), and one ends up preferring *and selling*, with the same commercial techniques, the 'personality' of a Leader...possessed of magic power (*ibid*, p.119).

---

[9] D.W. Smythe, "Mass media; mythmaker and brainwasher" *The Carillon* November 8, 1968, p.6.

Armed with the capital, labour, motivation research, market abalysis, mass media and other devices and skills, the commercial apparatus can condition and exploit appetitive habits or predispositions for fashions which glitter with values.

Martineau's (op.cit.) exposition on the utilization of motivation research emphasized the following values as being particularly useful and effective in programs designed to modify the behavior of those who encounter mass media: "individuation" (self-indulgence, self-expression, self-congratulation); "adventure" (romance, fun, thrills, excitement); "newness" (modernity, being "up to date", having the "latest", being "in style" -- there can even be a 'new nostalgia'); and of course, "youth" (sex, action, health, "more life"[10] as well as most of the values listed above, and more). Indeed, the value of youth has been associated so frequently with other values that a "cult of youth" and a youth industry[11] exist where "selling to the id" is the norm (e.g. see Winter and Nuss, 1969, 42-74; 275-276; and Kopkind, 1974, p.35).

---

[10] See Benjamin DeMott, "The 'More Life' School" Saturday Review, March 28, 1970, pp.25-26.

[11] R. Stelzer (1971) tells us that (a) teenagers' buying power (in the U.S.A.) in 1970 was 21 billion dollars; (b) families with teenagers spend more than others and the teenagers influence family spending; (c) teens in the U.S.A. own over 1-½ million cars; (d) the 10% of the female population that are teenagers buy 25% of all cosmetics sold, and the 14% of the male population that are teenagers buy 40% of the trousers and 33% of the sweaters. (These are merely examples and are not unlike the proportions of other goods and services bought by teenagers. See e.g. Winter and Nuss op.cit). Stelzer is President of Student Marketing Institute Inc. (a firm which advises other firms on the arts of persuading youth). He also publishes a column entitled "What young people think" which is syndicated by the Associated Press and carried in over 300 papers. His motto is: "It is easier to start a habit than to stop one -- and with youth first impressions last". Stelzer is, apparently, a very rich man. (See: Voice of American Forum Lectures entitled The Teen-Agers World, pp.68-73; also Winter and Nuss, op.cit., 66-74 and Kopkind, 1974).

Mass Media and the Cult of Youth: Selling Synthetic Apparitions and Revolution

Hall and Whannel's (1964) study of the popular arts provides a rich documentation of how and for what ends the "cult of youth" is cultivated. They provide evidence which suggests that what is commonly called a "youth culture" is really a "provided culture" (p.282) wittingly and cleverly manufactured and sold to exploit the purchasing power of both the affluent young and their more elderly counterparts who frequently reflect a sense of nostalgia for their lost youth and a fear of death in the ways they imitate in dress, language and behavior generally, the attractive "with-it" young (see e.g. ibid. pp.275-302, Martineau, 1971, pp.157-158). The creation of artificial wants, the objects of which are what Arendt (op.cit.) called "values", is facilitated by continually saturating the environment (as in van den Haag's (op.cit.) mass media and Ellul's (op.cit.) propaganda) with a "thicket of unreality": illusions, synthetic novelty, and "happenings" -- planned, planted or incited "pseudo-events" (Boorstin, op.cit., p.12).[12]

Within this "provided culture" of commercial music, dance, dress, comportment, argot and so forth, certain themes "recur with emphasis" (Hall and Whannel, op.cit., p.282). Along with the associations of youth with vivacity, action, sex, modernity, adventure, and health, Hall and Whannel (ibid., pp.282-283) found an emphasis recurrently placed on

---

[12] Boorstin (op.cit., 1964, pp.11-12) claims that "pseudo-events" possess the following characteristics: they are "happenings" which are contrived primarily for the purpose of being reported or reproduced on a massive scale; they are arranged for the "convenience" of the mass media; time and other relations are distorted so that the resulting ambiguity can arrest interest or attention (and thereby be "newsworthy"); they are generally intended to be self-sulfilling prophecies.

"physical image" and a "rejection of authority in all its forms and hostility toward adult institutions and conventional social andmoral customs".

Pseudo-events designed to market the fashionable values, carefully contrived to constitute the "image" of the celebrity, are prototypical. For example, the latest, glamourous, or "cool" (studiously casual, indifferent, world-weary, and inarticulate) hero, or anti-hero with his retinue of managers, flunkies, promoters and "groupies" (young girls who offer sex to the "star")[13] is besieged by a youthful crowd who have broken police cordons (arranged beforehand by the promoter of the contrived but seemingly spontaneous happening). The "action" is video and audio taped; broadcast and televised "live"; and filmed for a "soon to be released documentary" (whose audience will be mainly other young people) about what the young think (or value, or feel, or want, or believe in, or object to, or are concerned about), or are trying to tell their supposedly out-of-touch, old, pathetic, morally compromised but authoritarian and repressive elders. The celebrity drops an apparently spontaneous phrase which miraculously is reproduced on decals, posters, shirts, and other paraphenalia which might include the latest "hit" record (also soon to be released) or ghost-written" book." As one pop-culture impressario confided to Hall and Whannel (op.cit.) who conclude that the sociology of teenage tastes can be studied as an aspect of the sociology of the entertainment business (p.302): teenagers have their "tastes changed for them" (p.286). What is "valued" depends upon what is supplied (p.299). Enterpreneurs attempt to "pre-empt and manipulate taste directly...always in the direction of some [lucrative, commerical] formula" (*ibid.*).

---

[13] See the Los Angeles Free Press, January 1, 1971, p.26

[14] See for example, J. Heck's report: "A good year for the button salesman" The Carillon, October 17, 1969, p.5, and The Ubyssey, October 31, 1969, pp.16,18.

The Selling of Trivial Difference: Marketing "Counter Culture"

The deceptive appearance of so-called youth culture as a self-sufficient, youth-generated, peer-dominated, spontaneous expression of an allegedly unadulterated teenage set of values and precocious creativity, is, according to Hall and Whannel (*ibid.*) readily managed "because of [the] high emotional content", the de-emphasis of verbalization (p.282), and "the limited subject-matter and emotions dealt with" in this commercially prepared (synthetic) "life style" (p.279).[15] Although some characteristic of a small minority group may set a "trend" when, for example, it is publicized as "news" or "human interest", the commercial collosus can readily co-opt and transform the object of interest ("creeping ordinariness") for its own purposes through the use of simplification, stereotype, and its other wealth of capital, devices and techniques (e.g. see footnote 17, and Kopkind, 1974, p.35; Nietzke, 1972). Eventually, anyone could, for example, become a "week-end hippie" -- if the appropriate accoutrements were purchased, the formula appearance was affected, and if the appropriate conventions of speech and drug usage were modified. Then, of course, it is a small step to be "tuned in and turned on" during the entire week: the modern young executive could substitute "dope with wine" or "electric lemonade" at rock concerts, for hard "sauce" at the cottage or cocktail party, and tell his "freaky friends" (who did the same) that he was going to "revolutionize" mahogany row, now that he had "got his shit together". (This could mean that all his subordinates at "the place" (office) would then be able to deal with him more "openly" and be more "authentic"[16] as he and they collaborated on plans to increase sales or

---

[15] Of course, this is not hindered by the vanity and ignorance of the young which, in proportions, may be faithful reproductions of those qualities present in their elders (not excluding psychologists and sociologists): The promoters flatter adolescents and exploit their ignorance by incessantly praising them forbeing more sophisticated, progressive, and creative than our (the promoters') generation and asserting that they (the adolescents -- not just some) have created a new and better culture. Unfortunately, some adults who should know better, echo these manipulative (for avarice) lies. Too many social and behavioral science people (armed with little more substantial than "research data" gathered from questionnaires; e.g. see Blackburn op.cit.1969, pp.200-201; Pat Smith "What did you learn in school today" The Press, October 9, 1969, p.3 and Finney, 1971), write books and articles and speak, in serious tones, of the "youth culture", the great influence of peers (e.g. Munns, 1972) and the decline of adult influence. (Saturday Review, January 10, 1970; T. Rozak The Making of a Counter Culture, Doubleday, 1969, p.1).

Perhaps what has occurred is not so much a decline in adult influence per se; but rather the influence of adults, who have in the past excercised power without rivals, has seemed to decline as the influence of other adults has increased. This development one may argue, is mystified by people who mistakenly take the effects to be the cause: peer influence, (the effect of the increased influence of businessmen whose instruments include the mass media) is supposedly diminishing adult influence. Some people may not see that the phantasms of peer influence, on which, thanks to the mass media accounts, they centre their attention, divert them from seeing the common factor which informs teenagers actions.

By the 1960's, nearly every household in North America had acquired a representative or agent for business as a permanent (and convenient -- for babysitting) guest. This guest, disguised by its self-explanations, the technical mysteries hidden inside its opaque glass and veneer costume, and its ability to give every family a "womb with a view" (apologies to Barzun, 1961) is affectionately nick-named "T.V.". Accordingly, people who are obsessively worried about peer influence might take notice of Edmund Burke's comment to those who confuse names with vices: "You are terrifying yourself with ghosts and apparitions, whilst your house is the haunt of robbers" (Williams, 1968b, p.33).

After he had reviewed what is presently known about social learning, Bandura (1971, p.10) concluded that as mass media models "are increasingly... used, parents, teachers and other traditional role models assume a less prominent role in social learning."

[16] See J. Klemesrud "Having Wonderful Encounter", New York Times Magazine, December 20, 1970, p.2-4, 13-20, and B. Maliver, Encounter groupers up against the wall, The New York Times Magazine, January 3, 1971, p.4.

profits)[17] (see Wallace, 1971; Sayre, 1974, p.146).

Similarly, promoters could increase their gate receipts by paying fees to Yippie celebrities (who had "books" to promote) to "appear" at rock concerts.[18] (Such are the ways of creeping capitalism)! Or, television producers could take advantage of the novelty; the aura of verisimilitude and contemporaneity; the action and adventure; the romance, sex and youth, associated with student activism and protest, by featuring such material in not only the "news", documentaries and drama; but real, living activists could be exploited (and co-opted) on "talk-shows". Brown, (op.cit. 1971, pp.264-265) reports the description of "the 'now' subject matter" of one such television series called "Head-master" given by its producer: "student militancy, marijuana, sex, education". Indeed, the mutual exploitation of mass media and activists appears, to the present writer, to have been an important phenomenon in both the spreading of turmoil and the transformation of serious attempts to produce the dramatic changes in the economic, political and social arrangements (which were implicit in profound criticism) into various sorts of fashions or fads which could not, because they were fashions (see Poggioli, op.cit.) endure for long.[19]

---

[17] Andrew Kopkind (T.V. guide, The New York Review of Books. August 8, 1974, p.35) wrote: "...the broadcasters allowed counter-culture hipsters and new left...activists to re-program their...stations. The idea, of course, was to develop an audience of young people to whom the new cultural gear might be sold: boutique clothes, phonograph records, stereo equipment, health foods, hair styles."

Christopher Lasch (Can the left rise again? New York Review of Books October 21, 1971, 36-48) has also observed how people deceive themselves by believing they, on their own, transform themselves and their surroundings when they adopt (unconsciously) the rhetoric and debased ideas which saturate their experience: "...revolution...became the emptiest of cliches and was used indiscriminately by radicals, liberals, conservatives, advertising men, and the media, usually to describe changes that were non-existent" (p.37).

[18] See The Peak, October 30, 1968, p.3 for an account of an incident at the University of British Columbia.

However, just as the seriousness of political activists' program content and goals was compromised and reduced when their words and actions were sandwiched between "situation comedies" and commercials; and just as their criticisms were reduced to hackneyed pap by the commercial blending machines' commentators and "trendy" imitators, the association of youth with activism and turmoil through the same events could become a nearly universal "habit of mind".

Youth as a Stereotype in Mass Media

The build-up of a stereotype or image of youth could be expected because, as we have seen, mass media content is governed primarily by profit seeking (see Kopkind, 1974, 33-35; Brown, 1971, e.g. p.363) and format ("Style, tone, design, selective principles" and "...an orchestration of stereotypes and simplifications" for dealing with reality) (Hall and Whannel, op.cit. p.249)[20] Both large audiences, which are demanded for profit maximization, and format which must be designed to minimize cost and maximize sales, require simplification and repetition.

---

[19] This is not to argue that factors like a "downturn" in the economy, repression, co-optation, extinction (for lack of instrumental effects), fatigue, self-indulgence and the replacement of one youth population by another as time passed, were unconnected to the decline of activism and turmoil. See Kozol (1973) for a discussion of how some of these factors are related.

[20] Books like Les Brown's Television: The Business Behind the Box (1971); Robert Cirino's Don't Blame the People: How the News Media... Manipulate Public Opinion (1971); A.J. Leibling's The Press (Revised) (1972) D. MacDonald's The Media Game (1972) as well as Casty (op.cit.) Ellul (op.cit.) and the two volumes by Rosenberg and White (op.cit., 1964, 1971) provide ample documentation for Hall and Whannel's (op.cit., p.243) claim that "the classic formula for a journalistic style aimed at popular identification with a ...[large audience]" is: "impact, vigour, simplification, illustration..." ..."exaggeration...designed...for maximum impact; "shock issues" (p.239). "personalities" (p.228, 237) "heroes" - especially those appealing to the "common man" (p.226).

Studies reported by Adelson (in Winter and Nuss, 1969), Bandura (in Grinder, 1969), Jahoda and Warren (1965) and Musgrove (1964 a,b) have drawn our attention to stereotypes or "images" of youth which have been given massive and sustained visibility in the mass media. Furthermore, these writers have argued that one of the effects of the "high visibility" of these images may well be that of making the mythical stereotype come true. For not only are the adults who have commerce with adolescents part of the audiences; the adolescents themselves are also bombarded with the fashionable definitions inherent in the images. All the ingredients of the self-fulfilling prophecy are said to be present (e.g. see Bandura in Grinder, op.cit.).

The Image of Youth as Visionary-Victim

Adelson (op.cit.) claims that during the 1960's an image or stereotype of youth which was given high visibility, characterized the young person as a "visionary". The visionary was distinguished by a purity of moral vision. Furthermore, "in the way of the prophets" he was also a victim: He was betrayed, exploited, coerced, neglected and otherwise maltreated by a venal adult world which perpetuated corruption through insidious manipulation of the perceptive, insightful, knowledgeable, morally precocious but powerless young. Yet this embodiment of wisdom and virtue, in the face of victimization by adult corruption, could be a man of action (ibid, pp.1-2). Faithfully reproduced in the stereotype, was the simple, but time-honored dramatic formula (for thrilling and instructing the unsophisticated) consisting of a saint-like creature battling heroically against the immense forces of evil which surround him.[21] However, the elements shared by this stereotype and its more passive counterpart (often referred to as the "anti-hero": a kind of passive visionary-victim)[22] were youth, moral superiority, precociousness, powerlessness, and victimization.[23]

The visionary-victim stereotype featured in literary works was given further visibility by research reports (and popularizations of the same) which were based on "conspicuous but atypical enclaves" of adolescents (usually elite university students from affluent families) (*ibid*, p.3). As we saw above, mass media have many reasons to grasp and use such material: the conspicuous or unusual subject arrests attention; youth and sex sell well and so on. Jahoda and Warren (*op.cit.*, see Winter and Nuss, p.39) drew similar conclusions, but suggested that there may be reciprocal influence between the mass media and the academy:[24]

> ...discontinuities...tend to be stressed, and ...give rise to the notion of youth culture. One reason for this may...be that it is all too easy to think only of anti-social, deviant or creative youth, because, mainly through the mass media, these will be the youngsters of high visibility.

---

[21] For examples of the active visionary, see the writings of William Burroughs, Jean Genet, Norman Mailer (also see Lash, 1971).

[22] Adolescent characters in J.D. Salinger's works are prototypes of the morally precocious, passive, powerless, "visionary-victim".

[23] E.Z. Friedenberg's popular work *The Vanishing Adolescent* (New York: Dell, 1962) may be implicated in the creation and popularization of what its author later admitted was an unfortunate portrayal. The book, said Friedenberg (quoted by Schrag 1967, p.98) "pictures the young as engaged in a gallant, if hopeless struggle with the timidity and corruption of the adult world, usually in the person of school officials; it would have been more accurate to picture American youth rather as already deeply implicated in the deeds and values of their culture. Mostly they go along with it and sincerely believe that in doing so they are putting down troublemakers and serving the best interests of their community."

[24] The use of unrepresentative samples (university students) may be more a matter of convenience for the investigator than a reflection of mass media influences.

As both scholars and mass media placed increasing and disproportionate emphasis on discontinuities and conflicts between adults and adolescents, "the effects of visibility may [have made] the mythical stereotype based on it come true, owing to acceptance...of this stereotype by the very object of the stereotyped perception" (ibid, p.40). A study by Meisels and Canter (1971) reveals evidence which indicates that some young people had been affected by the flattering stereotype. When they asked students to indicate the extent to which they, their parents, and their peers agreed with statements about "contemporary issues", Meisels and Canter found that on political issues like the Vietnam war students "shared perceived parental values but were significantly different from perceived peer values" (p.528). However, their data suggested that students judgements of peer attitudes "were systematically distorted in the progressive direction" and that the students were "far less progressive" than they, or others imagined. They concluded that students themselves were apparently influenced by propaganda about a "generation gap" which didn't exist (ibid, p.529).[25] Similarly, a study by Blair and Pendleton (1971) produced evidence which suggests that at least teachers like those involved in their study (of teacher estimates of adolescents' attitudes about "certain contemporary issues") apparently were affected as well: The teachers consistently over-estimated the extent of students' opposition to the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, the draft, police and other adult expressions of authority. Indeed, this sample of teachers apparently had a consistently exaggerated sense of the extent deviant and progressive attitudes are held by students.

---

[25] One of the most striking features of the data in the Meisels and Canter study was the consistency with which students placed their own positions between those of their parents on the one side and their peers on the other.

Apparently, when business with its astonishing array of advertisers and mass media resources develops and cultivates "the worhip of youth" (Martineau, op.cit., pp.157-158) by unremittingly conditioning an association of its wares with youth, virtue, wisdom and all things "valuable", the effects are not merely commercial. All distinctions are obliterated under the general categories which are used. Accordingly, even the most ignorant adolescents are instructed by Time's (August 17, 1970) cover to "educate your parents". That "cover story" entitled "When the young teach the old learn" includes testimony from millionaire businessmen and prominent politicians about how "...my children wakened me..."; how "my sons put me on the right track..."; and how the children "transformed me from a clod into a citizen". Such items when considered together with other manifestations of youth worship may well contribute to the belief by the ignorant young that they are wiser and more virtuous than the old — the adults. Furthermore, some adults may be convinced as well. And that exacerbates the problem.

In summary, a stereotype of youth based on some characteristics of a small elite (e.g., those described by Flacks (op.cit.)) gained high visibility. A "generation gap" which apparently did not exist (e.g., see Adelson op.cit.; Berrion et al, 1967; Cauthen et al, 1971; Elkin and Westley,1955, 1957; Flacks op.cit.; Gorsuch and Smith, 1972; Morris and Small, 1970; Thomas, 1971) was repeatedly advertised as being real. This stereotype and the propaganda about a generation gap evidently produced in some adults and adolescents, a tendency to perceive youth as a homogeneous mass the defining attributes of which were inappropriate.

Distinctions were obliterated by the "thought cliche" when the global category "youth" was used in such familiar generalizations as "today's youth are alienated". Accordingly, the process and its consequences might be described appropriately by Ezra Pound's observation[26] that "...when...the application of word to thing goes rotten, i.e., becomes slushy and inexact, or excessive or bloated, the whole machinery of social and individual thought goes to pot".

When images of the sort discussed above are repetitiously placed before the various publics (which include the young) together with the popular and traditional criticisms (see Barzun, 1954; Hofstader, 1963) of schools in which youth is stored and spent, one should not be surprised if turmoil ensues.

Youth, the Schools and Extravagant Expectations

Turmoil was especially likely to occur when the volume, vigour (though not necessarily rigour) and aggressiveness of the criticism increased (Greene, 1973 and Schrag, 1967); when troubling conditions which schools had been expected to improve (Barzun 1954, e.g. pp.11-12) became more visible and bothersome;[27] and when "the common expectation" is that "the young should be those who act, who make things happen" (Rozak, 1969, p.1).[28]

Boorstin (*op.cit.*) has described how people in a contemporary commercial society harbor and are encouraged to build and maintain extravagant expectations:

---

[26] Hall and Whannel (*op.cit*., p.85) This is taken from Pound's *How to Read*.

[27] e.g. see "Detroit, home of motors, muggings and murders" *The Manchester Guardian* May 4, 1974, p.18 (and Hacker, 1970, 1973; Kempton, 1973; Kozol, 1973).

[28] Rozak who was not always assiduous about making important distinctions and qualifications in his generalizations asserted that "...The fact is...cultural innovation in America" was the "captive of youth" (1969 p.1).

> By harboring, nourishing and even enlarging our extravagant expectations, we create the demand for the illusions with which we deceive ourselves. And which we pay others to make to deceive us...
>
> The making of the illusions which flood our experience has become the business of America... I am thinking not only of advertising and public relations and political rhetoric, but of all the activities which purport to inform and comfort and improve and educate and elevate us...
>
> We have become so accustomed to our illusions that we mistake them for reality. We demand them (pp.5-6).

Barzun (op.cit., 1954, e.g. pp.11-12) and Hofstadter (op.cit., see pp. 299-390) have given detailed accounts of the excessive (and sometimes bewildering) expectations with which Americans have burdened their schools.[29]

Americans have established a tradition of expecting the schools "to do everything that the rest of the world leaves undone" (Barzun, op.cit., 1954, p.11) (and undo some of the things the rest of the world has done and continues to do).[30] In brief, common opinion in the U.S.A. has expected and was encouraged to expect (e.g. see Hofstadter, op.cit., p.305-306) the impossible, given the cultural, economic and social conditions that were apparently inherent in capitalism (see Jencks, 1972, pp.253-265); the rather eneven distribution of intelligence in the population; and the limits biology places on what man can do or be.

---

[29] Due to the cultural envelopment (domination or imperialism -- see Dexter, 1970) of English-speaking Canada by Americans, these remarks may not be totally inapplicable to Anglo-Canada.

[30] See for example "Educators hold key to pollution control" Edmonton Journal June, 1972, p.44 or "Educational system to be used" Moncton Times November 20, 1972, p.3.

As advocates of mass education in the U.S.A. campaigned to persuade people to support universal schooling "the supposed political and economic benefits of education" were stressed rather than "passion for the development of the mind (or) pride in learning and culture" (Hofstadter, op.cit., p.305).[31] Furthermore, different and contradictory justifications were presented to the various interests and publics (ibid, p.305-306). To the extent that the support of each was contingent upon the fulfillment of their respective expectations; and to the extent that the satisfaction of some expectations were incompatible with the satisfaction of others, one could expect that the schools and teachers would be subjected to various criticisms and pressures. Under these circumstances, the impossibility of being everything for everybody was not infrequently and perhaps unwittingly, hidden by manufacturing the appearance of consensus: If educational objectives were defined by using vague abstractions (e.g. see Barzun, 1961, p.113) like "good citizenship" and "responsibility" each person, interest group, or class could read his/its own cultural longings and sacred values into such definitions. Accordingly, strife arising from the plethora of contending and irreconcilable claims which were made on schools could be attenuated if not totally pre-empted.

Unfortunately, solutions to one set of problems are often, perhaps always, the creators of another set. Counterfeit-solutions can be particularly troublesome.

---

[31] The phenomenon of farming-out the burdens of political and economic ambitions to the schools may have been both an effect and a cause of the impoverished, or at least very limited, character of a political culture which continues to plague the Americans.

The Costs of Substituting Schooling for Politics

Accordingly, when no burdens are rejected, when school people do not refuse assignments which they are incapable of completing successfully; when educators involve themselves promiscuously with all comer's problems, they thereby prevent themselves from making any significant attachment to the solution of any of them (Wallerstein and Starr, 1971, vol. I, pp. 123-130, 530-535).[32] Furthermore, by accepting all burdens and problems which the publics are only too glad to give away, instruments which might be more suitably applied to them are ignored and neglected. Accordingly, the burdens of defects, deficiencies and difficulties persist and grow; and teachers publicly accuse one another of not bearing a fair share of them as if each was not already hampered enough by the indignant complaints and ill-will heaped upon them by the publics whose extravagant expectations remain unfulfilled.[33] Distracted by a faith in the dogma that education (taken to mean schooling) is the hope of the world, the populace remains primitive in politics, ignorant of economics, simple-minded in social affairs, undistinguished in taste, fearful in personal relations, barbarous in moral matters and crass in culture generally (see Gorz, 1968).

One might speculate that this practice of asking teachers to fix-up all of man's defects and deficiencies may also lead teachers to unwarranted conclusions with respect to their abilities and importance. Such requests can be flattering; and flattery may abet foolish ambitions the pursuit of which can do harm to the teacher and others (e.g. see Kozol, 1972, a. b. c; 1973). This too may partially account for the enthusiasm with which more than a few teachers spend misplaced effort in the shadows of some of the glamourous illusions that are advertised as highly valuable and accessible in mass media (Kozol, 1972a). For example, among the lofty effects schools have, in the past decade, been called upon to mass produce are "individuality" and "creativity" (e.g. Worth, 1972). Accordingly, school authorities cheered on by academics who also don't have to (and in some cases never did) teach in public schools, send teachers forth to confer individuality and creativity on everyone, even though the

---

[32] Birnbaum (op.cit., 1970, pp.154-155) expressed the opinion that "society's immediate demands on the universities, their porousness to the outside world and the functionalization of the culture they mediate, have reduced their long-term ability to shape that world...The contemporaneity of the university condemns it to a rapid technological obsolescence". This was said to be particularly likely when "universities (are) overburdened with varied and contradictory functions". Of course, public schools are threatened for different reasons. As Barzun (op.cit., 1961) said, they are in distress partly because teachers and schools try to be "everything for all" (p.71). Paul Goodman (1964) concurred when he wrote, that schools "expanding and aggrandizing, becoming the universal trainer, baby-sitter, and fix-it" lose the ability to perform academic functions (p.8).

---

[33] Other service groups like lawyers and physicians, perhaps because their members not infrequently think of themselves as enterpreneurs, tend to do their quarreling in private. Apparently they understand that the public airing of such exercises can be debilitating to the fulfillment of their goals. But quarreling over education is a public enterprise. In some places it appears to be the sole source of community recreation. In this, one of the few remaining mass participation sports, teachers play the part of whipping boys for all participants including themselves. Some university teachers have been known to be critical of high schools because of the unrefined qualities of many matriculants. Among the high school teachers there are those who deplore the fact that so many of the pupils they receive from junior high schools don't exhibit desirable traits the possession of which they suppose junior high school teachers should have and could have ensured. The elementary schools, in turn, receive their lumps from the junior high schools. And the parents of children who enter primary school are often told by inference that they should support kindergartens since they do not appear able to consistently provide adequately prepared entrants for the primary school. The parents in turn frequently blame the universities for the supposedly poor quality of teachers. In this melee, the limited abilities which teachers inevitably possess, are further limited as the loop is looped and relooped.

exclusive or elite connotations of these essentially comparative terms might have suggested the hopeless character of such ambitions. Few seemed to notice that "the cost of individuality...is beyond the average income" (van den Haag, op.cit. in Casty, 1968, p.5). Similarly, observations like those made by Hacker (1970) with respect to the "illusion of individuality" apparently have not dampened the enthusiasm[34] of those who prefer such illusions to facts, knowledge, distinctions and standards which are mistakenly presumed to be unconnected with and even harmful to the development of individuality and creativity (see the Canadian Press release entitled "Professor claims facts stifle creativity" Moncton Times, November 9, 1972, p.24). Said Hacker:

> Most people are ordinary, and ordinary people are ordinary, regardless of the time or society or setting in which they live. Moreover, ordinary people are relatively unintelligent, incapable of abstraction...lacking any special qualities of talent or creativity. They are for the most part without drive or perseverance easily discouraged they prefer the paths of security...All save an exceptional few...lack the capacity for attainments that transcend the mediocre (pp.161-162)
>
> It is, of course, easy enough to solve the problem simply by debasing the coinage of individuality. Anyone who wishes to discover uniqueness in every member of the community can achieve this end by inflating small talents and marginal distinctions. ...Perhaps something is gained by telling the orthodox that they are unconventional, by persuading the weak that they are creatures of courage. Such fictions may obviate the endemic envy of the average and impart a veneer of romance to lack-lustre lives.

---

[34] See The A.T.A. Magazine , November-December, 1973 (vol. 54, No.2). The "theme" of this issue was "creativity" and the contents were more noticeably reflective of enthusiasm than understanding on the part of most of the contributors who discussed the topic (e.g. pp.2, 4-6, 32-34). One notable exception was S. Boston's contribution (14-15) which among other things suggested that self expression can be a species of self-indulgence (which has no necessary or obvious connection with creativity).

> Certainly...those choosing to congratulate everyman on his individuality tell gentle lies...and... encourage the unexceptional to believe that all avocations are of equal quality (p.166).

Popular Criticism and the Growth of the Explanations Industry

The readiness of school people to attempt the mass production of such custom-tailored, exclusive and illusive (for most of us) qualities[35] may have been encouraged by the apparent necessity of placating students who had heard from the mass media (and from the more common and vociferous critics of teachers and schools -- especially those who had received massive exposure since the late 1950s) that students were being cheated of these and other valuables.[36] Popular criticism (pop ed crit) had become a more valuable commodity when, in the late 1950s as television became ubiquitous and people received "news" of such things as Sputnik, the market for "explanations" underwent a "growth-spurt".

Increasingly, American and,(in true colonial-reflex fashion)

---

[35] See: J.G. Nicholls, Creativity in the person who will never produce anything original and useful: The concept of creativity as a normally distinguished trait. American Psychologist, August, 1972, 717-727.

Also P. Vernon, Creativity: A current bandwagon. Canadian Psychologist, 1973, vol.14, I, 51059.

[36] The reader is referred to the writings of those Schrag (1967) and Klohr (1971) called "the romantic critics". These include Edgar Friedenberg, Paul Goodman, Jules Henry, and John Holt. Others that rate a glance are Carl Bereiter, Ivan Illich, Lloyd Trump, and Charles Silberman.

Also see Brustein (1969) (in Wallerstein and Starr, 1971, Vol.I (546-552) p.548); and Broudy (1971); Fairfield (1971); Klohr (1971) and others in The Humanist XXXI, 3 (May/June) 1971.

Canadian schools[37] came under the fire of critics who were not averse to using the mass media[38] to air their increasingly intemperate attacks on teachers and schools. Common themes in their utterances included the following:

'Pop Ed Crit'

(a) Schools -- not just a few, some, or many, but schools in general -- were not doing a good job. (b) Students were so regimented and oppressed by teachers that they couldn't develop their "creative potential"; (c) The

---

[37] When one compares the characteristics of American public schools (especially those of the larger urban and suburban schools which receive the most attention) with their counterparts in Canada, one cannot avoid feeling very uncomfortable with the uncritical and enthusiastic reception so many Canadians give the pronouncements of American critics of schools whose utterances are informed by un-Canadian but desperate and deplorable conditions (see e.g., The New York Times: "Under attack from left and right." April 4, 1971, p.E9; "Attacks continue on coast college" November 15, 1970, p.65; "Schools accused on drug problem", November 15, 1970, p.37; "Four more teachers are robbed during classes...bringing total in last 12 days to seven", October 22, 1972, p.49; "School voilence robs children of an education", January 17, 1971, p.55; "How to get more for the money", October 22, 1972, p.E9: "Millions in school aid found unused", December 3, 1972, p.44; "Less for those who need more" "Program that flunked"; "Frustration at John Dewey High School",December 10, 1972, p.E5; "Flunking grades for many of them", December 15, 1970, p.E7; "For more of the three R's", October 15, 1972, p.E11; "Decline continues inreading ability of pupils in city", November 19, 1972, p.1, 76; "Lag in reading scores blamed on teachers...", December 3, 1972, p.109; "Another cry for help", December 19, 1971, p.E7; "Survey finds voters across the nation opposed bonds or taxes for education: November 8, 1970, p.85).

The American-promoted educational prescriptions for the cure of cultural and social pains are regularly imported into Canada with American books, periodicals, professors, and mass media programs, the combination of which overwhelms the more modest observations and less publicised views of Canada's own folk who are situated in a different set of conditions (e.g. "Open classrooms embraced as instant cure-all.. [illegible] The Globe and Mail, January 25, 1973, p.W8): and "How to get more for the money" The New York Times, October 22, 1972, p.E9).

[38] See P. Schrag, Education's "romantic" critics Saturday Review February 18, 1967, p.80.

"undemocratic" character of schools was harmful to students; (d) Schools were destroying a presumed native curiosity in children; (e) The old ways of teaching were wrong; (f) Curricula which had linear sequences and in other ways imposed requirements, together with school regulations and routines, conditioned conformity and destroyed individuality, dignity, spontaneity, identity and integrity; (g) The schools deprived children of the opportunity to pursue their own interests; and (h) Furthermore, they provided no joy or ecstacy.

As time passed and peoples' troubles were intensified (e.g. "stagflation")[39] the critics' rhetoric became more vituperative, and nearly hysterical if not vicious and spiteful: Bereiter (1972) claimed that teaching was immoral; Illich (1973) declared that since the society was in such a mess and since schools allegedly kept it that way, society should be "deschooled". And Holt (1966, 1970a, b, 1971) whose intemperate rhetoric and name-calling seemed to betray an intense dislike for teachers and an inability to sense the importance of distinctions and qualifications, at first advocated an emasculated version of Dewey's democratic education (even though what he was attacking was what democratic education turned out to be; Schrag, op.cit.); and then later concurred with Illich (Holt, 1971). Even though both Goodman (1960, 1964) and Friedenberg (1962, 1965, 1966) had at the end of the 1960s modified their views, they set the style of the 1960s when in their early and best known works they portrayed "the young" as victims of "the accumulation of the missed and compromised revolutions of modern times, with their ambiguities and social imbalances" falling "most heavily on the young, making it hard to grow up" (Goodman, 1960; also Curtis, op.cit., p.139). Both represented schooling as "stupifying" (Goodman 1960, p.244) and prison-like (ibid, p.244; Friedenberg, 1965). School people were called "school monks" (Goodman, 1964, p.7) who through "progressive regimentation and brainwashing" worked to produce a "fascism-of-the-center" which was "the goal of the school-monks themselves" (ibid p.10). In the same vein, teachers were "cops" and schools were "concentration camps" (ibid, p.18) and "universal traps" that were, are, and do "no good" (ibid, p.31). Both Goodman and Friedenberg proposed the "liberation" of the young from the tyranny of the minions of the so-called "lower-middle-class" who staff the schools (Friedenberg, also see Schrag, op.cit., p.82) and the iniquitous state (Goodman): If schools and teachers there must be, then students should be all set "free".

---

[39] This term is used by economists like Paul Samuelson to denote the condition of high inflation and unemployment and coincident low growth-rate.

To School or Not to School

Seemingly oblivious to what Pestalozzi, Rousseau, Tolstoy, and Russell learned from their experiences, a stable of freedom evangelists armed with a liturgy of cosmic categories, hyperbole and half-truths crusaded on behalf of a paradise of Summerhills (see Goodman, 1964, Ch. III) where children would no longer have to practice self-denial (Schrag, op.cit. p.80) (as if self-indulgence was in danger of extinction). The pursuit of an ever-illusive identity or creativity or individuality became more important and "relevant" than learning how to read when people like Holt (op.cit.) joined the chorus of freedom sellers who formed a band-wagon for laissez-faire schooling, the educational counterpart to anarcho-capitalism.

Some intelligent and knowledgeable persons (e.g. see Barr, 1971;

Barzun, 1954, 1961; Kozol, 1972a, b, c, 1973) have thought that one of the reasons children are sent to schools is that children can thereby acquire (a) some knowledge of what actualities and possibilities exist; (b) some competencies to evaluate or judge which of these are desirable or undesirable; and which are unavoidable or subject to change, when or after (not before) the child has acquired knowledge of them and skills to assess them; and (c) skills to intervene effectively on behalf of whatever knowledgeable judgement deems to be desirable. These same thinkers have asserted that the acquisition of disciplined knowledge[40] necessarily involves hard work and discomfort. ("Comfort takes precedence over curiosity" said Barzun, 1961, p.85). The acquisition of interests that have more than momentary life; the development of abilities to discriminate between the shoddy and the substantial; the shaping and honing of skills which enable one to endure and survive the moral squalor and obdurate difficulties which shape the ambit of adult life, have all been thought to be associated with the experience of postponed gratification, perseverant effort and sacrifice (e.g. see Barr, op.cit. p.25; Kozol op. cit.). Such thought, however, did not temper the rhetoric of people like Holt (op.cit.) whose "enthusiasm for the untrammeled and gratuitous act"[41] and habit of making simple but sweeping generalizations, qualified them for starring roles in mass media as popular critics.

---

[40] i.e. Information selected and delimited through the application of technical procedures and ordered and organized in the light of the collective experience, conventions and standards of judgement of those who have developed and use the procedures, conventions and standards.

[41] S. Boston (The ATA Magazine, 54, 2 (November-December) 1973, pp. 14-15) has suggested that unconstrained self-expression has been equated (frequently and mistakenly) with creativity and freedom. This popular error may have been made popular by fellows like Holt. As Barzun (1961, p.125) observed, the word "creativity" has become "another excuse for caprice, for non-work".

Money, Mass Media and the Shape of Unreality: The Common Sense of John Holt

Accordingly, the young as well as their parents, neighbours and teachers were bombarded with such mass tabloid rubbish as "the old ways of teaching kids are wrong", (Weekend Magazine, September 7, 1968),[42] and "Why students crack up" (Macleans, December 15, 1965)[43] along with programs and books which assailed teachers and schools with little equivocation.

The gems of genius which the mass media appropriated and exploited, the pearls of wisdom which recurrently appeared in the so-called underground and student press (and served as slogans and illusions for many adolescents involved in educational turmoil), are (and were) especially easy to find in John Holt's writings.[44] The examples which follow illustrate the quality of material that was taken seriously by many young people and an astonishing number of older people among which group businessmen and their mass media helpers were particularly enthusiastic.[45] (See Oettinger and Marks, 1971; Nyquist and Hawes, 1972; The New York Times, December 10, 1972, p.E5).

---

[42] While this article never treated "ways of teaching" -- the writer merely used inflated language to deplore custodial rules and sanctions and extol the merits of freedom, which for him was the absence of rules and other limitations on self-indulgence -- the title no doubt confirmed the suspicions of those who had experienced some frustration and discomfort in school. The blatantly misleading title appears to be a cynical exploitation of the popular prejudice that up until very recently nobody had any sound ideas about teaching (Barzun, 1961, p.100). Here are some examples of the rhetoric; students were said to be "prisoners" (echoes of Goodman); and the author solemnly declared that "one of the nicest things to happen to me" was to hear a student say "I like to be free" (shadows of Holt).

[43] The author of this piece claimed that dropping-out, suicide ("on many campuses as predictable as highway deaths on a holiday weekend") serious emotional disturbances and mental illnesses were increasing due to "pressures of studies and examinations". Hundreds of thousands of such casualties were said to occur each year. The reader was encouraged to conclude that teachers who exerted "pressure" on students were a menace and that people should do something to help relieve the anxiety-ridden students from the pedagogues' "pressures".

[44] Holt's writing was probably more widely distributed than any of his fellow purveyors of "pop ed crit". Several editions of How Children Fail went through multiple printings and by April, 1971 the Dell edition had eight printings. The first edition was released circa 1964.

---

[45] Oettinger and Marks (1971) described why and how businessmen enthusiastically embraced, endorsed and used this type of educational criticism: it paved the way to magnificent sales and profits. Computer sales, rental, time and service; individual "instructional packages" (one or more for every child in every subject); and a bewildering assortment of other gadgetry and gimmicks could be sold in great quantities even though there was no substantial evidence that improvement would follow (see below).

One advocate of "open education" estimated that each classroom that was opened would require initial expenditures of $1100.00 - $1200.00 (Nyquist and Hawes, 1972, pp. 17-18).

The New York Times (December 10, 1972, p.E5) reported that the Ford Foundation's program of testing various sorts of "innovations" which were designed to implement the style of schooling advocated by the popular school critics, indicated that "the total impact of the reform movement was slight. The "nongraded" programs, "independent study," "flexible scheduling," "flexible space," and "team teaching" which "educational innovators" in the early 1960's "believed...would solve all learning problems" and "produce a better society", "flunked".

Performance in reading and mathematics had declined sharply and steadily (The New York Times (November 19, 1972, pp.1,76); teachers reported that "independent student activities (were) a threat to discipline"; the technological gadgetry "of all kinds is gathering dust" because "maintenance has proved more expensive than anticipated"; "much of the 'software' (commerical "packages" of instructional material) was poor"; and teaching staffs were reduced in order to pay for computer time (that was largely wasted). (See: The New York Times, December 10, 1972 "Program that flunked" (p.E5), and "Frustration at John Dewey High School" (p.E5); October 22, 1972, p.E9 "How to get more for the money"; November 15, 1970, p.E7 "Flunking grades for many of them". Also see The Globe and Mail, February 17, 1973 "Free choice" programs not working out, OFT claims: Teachers want return to compulsory...courses" (students were said to "opt for far easier" courses; teachers claimed "individualization...isn't working"; they said that "It would be difficult to find a school in which even one student's program is being orchestrated to suit his current state of development"; and the "imposition" of computers and "slick re-packaging" was associated with a higher pupil-teacher ratio); and Ramparts (March 4, 1974, 10-14) (Stelzer and Karger, 1974).

According to Holt (1970a) "nobody starts off stupid" (p.207); whatever stupidity there is in the population is put there by the schools, which institutions are said to "destroy" children's "extra-ordinary capacity for learning" (p.208). Not being one who is particularly willing to subject himself to the requirements of logical consistency and evidence, Holt claims at the same time that "learning does not...take place as a function of...external structure" (1971, p.61; 1970a). In spite of that, "the universities...opinion of a young person", said Holt, "determines to a very large degree what that person can or cannot do..." (1970b, see Wallerstein and Starr 1971, vol.I, p.333) and the conditions teachers create allegedly impair learning. Apparently, teachers are willing and able to "bore"children ("filling up their day with dull repetitive tasks that make little claim on their attention or demands on their intelligence") (1970a, p.210) and at the same time "confuse" them and make them "afraid" (ibid., p.208). Furthermore, school people are said to be "cruel" and "dishonest" (1966, see Winter and Nuss, p.147) imposers of "pressures" which encourage children to "cheat" (ibid., p.150) lose their "sense of joy"; endure "a sense of...subjection and slavery": (ibid. p.149); suffer "psychological disturbances" and commit suicide (ibid., p.150). Whenever teachers impose requirements on their charges they allegedly "manipulate" and "dehumanize" them; and in the bargain they eliminate "joy", "ecstacy" and "fun" (ibid., p.149) (and of course "you have to dig what you're doing...otherwise you become ineffective", 1971, p.61). Furthermore, "educational institutions do not and cannot teach competence" (1970b, see Wallerstein and Starr, vol.I, p.332) irrespective of what is done; and "the notion of schooling is fundamentally unsound anyway" (1971, p.21). "Knowing test information...and the development of real competency are not related" (ibid., p.61). This of course, doesn't prevent him from allegedly knowing that "children do not learn what is supposedly being taught" (1971, p.21). What is most important to understand is that "concern and care are the determining factors of whether or not you are a teacher" (1971, p.61). If one exudes "concern and care" and shuns "imposed structure" so that "spontaneous structure" can bloom (ibid) one can sit back and rest because "generally nothing is done first -- things happen together" (ibid). Those who do otherwise, defeat themselves and do harm to the students. Says Holt:

> ...If by 'teaching' we mean deciding for someone else what will be good for him to learn, and then arranging that learning into a sequence of tasks which we impose on him, such 'teaching' is without exception the enemy preventer and destroyer of learning.[46]

All of this is supposedly obvious when one considers the following generalizations: "Certainly one piece of learning is as good as another" (1970a, p.219). For "we don't and can't agree on what knowledge is essential" (ibid., p.217). "How can we say...that some knowledge is essential" (ibid., p.218-219). Apparently, children or students are part of nature and adults are properly apart from nature. Adults should therefore know their place and keep it: the introduction of foreign matter (adult intervention) intimidates nature whose spontaneous agents (things) go out on strike (they stop teaching) when human adult teachers (who Holt seems to assume, are un-natural things) impose themselves, or their designs, on the natural world. When those who have commerce with small chilren attempt to teach, nature resists. Accordingly, "the so-called 'child's garden' has been turned into a prison" (1971, p.61)!

---

[46] "Input" Psychology Today, July, 1972, p.4. Emphasis added.

Holt's notions about intelligence and the nature of the world are also revealing: "By intelligence" he says "we mean a style of life" (1970a, p.205), Furthermore, "the bright child feels the universe is...a... reasonable and trustworthy place. The dull child feels that it is senseless...and treacherous" (ibid., p.207). But of course, there wouldn't be any "dull" children ("nobody starts off stupid") if teachers were replaced by cooks who were humble enough to think that children know more about nutrition than themselves (the child knows best; ibid., pp. 220-221): "The school" wrote Holt, "should be a great smorgasbord...from which each child could take whatever he wanted, and as much as he wanted, or as little" (ibid., p.222).

However, it might be difficult for adults to resist making furtive manipulations as one of Holt's anecdotes about himself betrays:

> When I taught...I wanted to get the masks off and the barriers down so the kids could be whatever they were. [This was accomplished]... but none of this could be quantified or measured (1971, p.61).

Apparently, the possibility that these children "were" mask-wearers -with-barriers-up, didn't occur to Holt; or alternatively, it may be permissible to intervene for some adult objective if you are a good fellow. However, according to Holt, this would exclude teachers.

Since Holt believes that students should be allowed to do what they wish, when they want to, and for as long or as short a period as their whims allow (Wallerstein and Starr, 1971, vol.I, p.392), anyone who presumes to disagree, is treated to a binge of name-calling (1966,: see Winter and Nuss, pp.146-148). Anyone who argues, like Barzun (1961, p.125), that the young are made "innocently conceited and hurtfully ignorant of both the range of common achievement and the quality of genius" when teachers abdicate their duty to judge and criticize, is, in Holt's judgement, selfish, vain and avaricious (1966; Winter and Nuss, op.cit. p.148). The teacher who attaches some importance to the notion of excellence, and observes that its meaning is threatened by the "cult of undirected choice"; "thinking for oneself without encountering the objections of a better thinker"; and loose-talk about "creativity" and "self-evaluation" (Barzun, 1961, p.126) -- such a teacher is one who would allegedly "victimize" students due to ignorance and weakness of character (Winter and Nuss, op.cit., p.146).

Holt's advocacy of allowing students to indulge their already existing inclinations to whatever extent they desire is tantamount to a call for teachers to abandon all endeavors to develop new interests, and confine themselves to encouraging students to behave as though wants are really needs or necessities. It is, in effect, a plea for people to abandon the distinction between the desired and the desirable which even Dewey recognized as important. Dewey wrote:[47]

> The fact that something is desired only raises the question of its desirability; it does not settle it. Only a child in the degree of his immaturity thinks to settle the question of desirability by reiterated proclamation: 'I want it, I want it, I want it.'

Objections to Holt: The Development of Intellect and Interests as a Premise for Teaching

If one is satisfied that whatever vague inclinations, whims and genuine interests young people acquire from experiences in their lives outside of school are desirable, adequate and sufficient (as opposed to trivial, inadequate or even incompatible with, or harmful to the intellectual and aesthetic interests which one might well expect schools to promote) one might be able to understand why Holt tenders the advice he does. However, if one becomes knowledgeable about how well the commercial apparatus, with its mass media,[48] assiduously plants and cultivates the predisposition to treat wants as necessities, one might raise objections. For example, one might assert that there are grounds for believing that commercial culture, outside of schools, does not provide the conditions which are necessary for many people to develop a sense of the importance and benefits of such things as work, self-discipline, postponed gratification[49], aesthetic sensibility, intellectual skills, durable interests, significant or important knowledge and morality. Furthermore, if one sees "interests" that are only manifestations of a destructive self-indulgence, to be the main by-product of life outside the school -- and inside the web of mass (commercial) culture -- then one may regard Holt's advice as something less than distilled wisdom.

---

[47] (The construction of good) See Gartner (1973), p.131.

In summary, there are reasonable grounds for questioning the merits and assessing the costs (psychological, cultural and financial) of the "free", "open", non-directive, happiness-seeking[50] type of education advocated by Holt and other popular critics. One is not necessarily a scoundrel or pervert[51] if one disagrees with those who, to paraphrase Barzun (1961) because of their "childish faith in the unconditioned", worship spontaneity. One who does not abdicate his adulthood and teaching duties vis a vis his students, is not, then, automatically ignorant, stupid and/or evil. Schools that do not entertain[52] their students with a regular menu of ecstacy and joyous delights, are not necessarily prisons or concentration camps in which inmates are mutilated. Universities or kindergartens which are not democratic -- but rather assert that "the phantasms of public opinion" and nose counts are very unreliable and inappropriate instruments for discovering and deciding what is true -- are not necessarily malevolent with respect to students' interests in particular and mankinds' well-being in general.[53] Curricula which require students to persevere, work hard, tolerate discomfort, and accept criticism are not necessarily more harmful than beneficial to students. Courses which require students to curb self-indulgence, postpone gratification, endure tedious but necessary tasks and study subject matter that does not (at first and without effort) seem to have a direct bearing on questions of importance -- are not necessarily "irrelevant". As Trachtenberg (op.cit.) observed:

---

[48] Television and radio programs, advertising, the print press, movies, spectator sports, heroes, billboards, pseudo-events, mass merchandising displays, samples, beauty contests, exhibitions and commercially contrived festivals are some of the resources which are used to create the pseudo-needs and pseudo-interests which can be exploited. See Ellul (op.cit.) and Smythe (op.cit.).

[49] Barr (1971, p.25) has observed that one result of having the school adapt to the child's desires and otherwise operate on the assumption that "everything that is good for him must be fun for him" is that the child "learns to consult only his desires as guides to action. Another is that he never learns to tolerate the least cessation in the steady stream of gratification which he is used to". Hacker (1970) has developed a compelling argument which suggests that when this occurs on a large scale, the future of man as a species is imperilled. Barzun (1961, p.126) has made similar observations: A child, he says, who is insulated from the evaluations and directions of adults develops a "critical discontent only about others"; his own aims "measured by sheltered ambitions" never fail except "from extraneous causes".

---

[50] One wonders whether Holt has ever pondered Swift's definition of happiness ("the possession of being perpetually well-deceived").

[51] A widely circulated and apparently very influential paper by a Jerry Farber, "The student as nigger" (see The Gateway, March 26, 1969, pp.4-6) seems to accuse teachers in general (following the custom of pop critics) of being brutal, sadistic, deranged, authoritarians who, at the same time, are "prissy", "chickenshit", slave-camp wardens who are "short on balls"! The tone and contents of this article which appeared in an edition of every student newspaper I examined, were extrememly inflamatory and intemperate. The contents were so outrageously overstated and portions of them were so ill-conceived that Farber eventually expressed regrets (The Ubyssey, Oct. 31, 1969, p.2) about his thoughtlessness. Perhaps he sensed that such material can be more than merely mischievous and less than helpful.

[52] Arendt (op.cit.) has claimed that there is a genuine danger to education in making it entertaining: "This state of affairs, which indeed is equaled nowhere else in the world can properly be called mass culture; its promoters...are those who try to entertain the masses with what once was an authentic object of culture, or to persuade them that Hamlet can be as entertaining as My Fair Lady, and educational as well. The danger of mass education is precisely that it may become very entertaining indeed ...Great authors of the past who have survived centuries of oblivion and neglect may not survive an entertaining version of what they have to say" (Rosenberg and White, 1971, p.99).

One might also consider Barzun's (1961, p.56) observation that the extent to which teachers "enliven" the subject is the extent to which the student "can look on in passive discontent".

> the cry for 'relevance...is another example of an emerging pattern of impatience with analysis and contempt for history. It is also an example of the debasement of a good idea through sloganizing...In demanding relevance students often assume that only the contemporary,[54] which is to say the fashionable at the moment, is worth bothering about, that history being dead, should be junked, that they themselves are the arbiters of what is relevant or not, living or dead (p.129).

When people wielding the instruments of mass culture flatter the young and encourage them to regard themselves as being superior to their elders (as when Time Magazine [August 17, 1970] advises them to teach their parents; or when Margaret Mead [1970] does the same; or when Holt or his ilk indiscriminantly abuse adults with invective while propagandizing on behalf of self-expression, spontaneity and the glorified

---

[53] See Steinberg (1968) e.g. pp.180-196.

[54] Novelist Anthony Burgess has made a similar observation (see The New York Times Magazine, November 19, 1972, pp.22.30).

"happening") one might expect some of the young people, who have limited experience and/or intelligence, to assert themselves. Of course, they can do this most readily in conditions where adults abdicate their adulthood; where adults behave as though they are incapable of making discriminations and judgements; in situations where adults treat their own authority and power as defects or sources of embarrassment; and at times when adults, surrounded by the shoddy and immoral, will not set standards, make criticisms, express outrage and act on their convictions (see Kozol, 1972a, b, c; 1973).

When, as in the mass culture outside of school, reality is defined so that self-congratulation by the young is nearly guaranteed (Hacker, op.cit.), when mass media, promotors, hucksters and others deliberately exploit the "cheap response"; when discrimination is discouraged and powerful techniques for deliberate exploitation of confident ignorance, impulsivity, and lack of discrimination in people are deployed in even ones most private places,one might argue, like Williams (1963, p.250), that "educational training has to be equally deliberate."

However, teachers who were deliberate in their teaching and, as a consequence, made demands on their students which entailed discomfort, perseverance, hard work, and other prerequisites to competence, erudition, and cultivated interests at the same time violated student expectations and assumptions as to what experiences at school should and could be. For hadn't such mass media gurus as McLuhan (Miller, 1971) shown that print and books were outmoded and harmful? Wasn't "linear" reasoning "a snare and a delusion" (ibid, p.35)? Wasn't the demanded intercourse with books likely to perpetuate the "head-heart split" (ibid, p.34) which, (because we haven't "got it together") is allegedly "the explanation" of our discomforts -- "our modern predicament" (ibid.)? Aren't schools prisons and teachers sadistic (and otherwise perverted) tormentors of youth? Aren't teachers trying to "program" students to be "robots" who lack the "intuition", the "individuality", the "spontaneity", and the "creativity" which are necessary for the youthful victims to extricate themselves from the "predicament" of the present and the prospects of "1984"? There is compelling evidence that some such teachers have precipitated some educational turmoil (e.g. see The Globe and Mail, May 3, 1973, p.9; May, 1973, p.14).*

Turmoil and the Mass: The Ecology of Models and Social Learning in the Neo-capitalist Economy

As we have seen above, a variety of critical analyses (of monopoly capital, the "new imperialism" the consumer culture, and the social relations and conditions associated with those orders -- perhaps "disorders" is a more appropriate term) were digested by a select minority whose activism was, apparently, informed by that assimilation of political content. Furthermore, we have seen how the verbal and other behavior of this vivacious minority could be, and was, transformed into commercial values (news, images, slogans and so forth) due to the novelty, liveliness, and other readily exploitable qualities of their behaviors.[55] At the same time, other effects were suggested by an examination of the means by which the criticisms, ideology, and objectives that informed the minority's behavior were simplified, trivialized, and otherwise debased in the transformational processes used by the agents of commercial or mass culture.

---

*Secondary sources, interviews and an examination of a dossier of documents (which included some written by students who were immediately involved) have led the present writer to the conclusion that one such teacher was a central figure in the turmoil at Sir George Williams University in early 1969.

One of the proposed effects of the massive exploitation of these young people was that a stereotype of youth based on some traits of a highly visible minority was created and used by the means of mass communications. In these mass media where industry creates fashion, sells values, obliterates distinctions, and flatters the ignorant to exploit them, the young in general, were portrayed as a homogeneous population which was, in contrast to the "older generation" (notice how that term suggests that it's referent is also a homogeneous group) an active agent for eliminating mans' discomforts. Their behavior, supposedly guided by a pristine virtue and wisdom would usher in "the real thing" -- a paradise without pain where everyone could be a spontaneous, creative, individualistic funseeker. The youthful things, the fun things, the good things were all the same thing; and only corrupt, doltish, gerontocrats, and

---

[55] Of course this type of exploitation (e.g. of the dramatic or idiosyncratic) is a matter of general practice. For example, see The New York Times (December 19, 1971, p.34) for a description of how businesses such as printers, publishers, clothiers, and bowling-alley proprietors helped create and, at the same time, exploit the aura of romance, cleverness, and daring which became associated (via exposure) with an airplane hijacker who parachuted to stardom, comfort and freedom with $200,000.00.

The hijacking of aircraft (e.g. to Cuba in the early and mid-1960's) by politically inspired people had, of course, been used as news. And consequent to the publicizing of those initial flights, a growth in the frequency of "skyjacking" took place. However, according to The New York Times (January 7, 1973, p.1) by early 1973 "the majority" of aircraft hijackers were not inspired by political motives. The "escalation of the hijacking problem (sic) last year" (1972) (ibid.) had, of course, followed the dissemination of "news" of the "successful" skyjackers' actions (like the one referred to from December, 1971).

The present writer regards the increased incidence and coextensive depoliticization of skyjacking as a plausible parallel to the increased incidence and depoliticization of student activism: observationsl learn-principles (Bandura, 1971, 1969; Bandura, Ross and Ross, 1963a, b,; Bandura and Walters, 1963) are regarded as plausible explanatory principles common to both phenomena. At the same time, the same characteristics of the culture of neocapitalism enable these principles to be operative.

anybody who possessed authority stood between present pains and a hope-filled heaven. The "explanations industry" provided popular criticisms which created or at least reinforced popular opinions as to the source and nature of the discomforts that were common to the experience of its audience, and "answers", "explanations", or prescriptions for relief from the same (see Cannel and Macklin, 1974). More "freedom" for youth from the corrupting influence, restraints and trammels imposed by those like teachers who had authority, was allegedly a means of eliminating such grave maladies as "feelings of alienation", stunted "creative potential", pre-empted individuality, lack of fun, insufficient "participation" and "curtailed involvement". Authority as such, not just particular uses of it, was represented as enemy of a "consciousness" which was presumed to be capable of curing the world of its ills (e.g. Reich, 1970). The traditional liberal panacea for all difficulties, more liberty (as in "liberation") for the virtuous (i.e. those not yet corrupted by institutions or adults who stubbornly insist on the merits of restraints) was incessantly advertised and associated with the youth stereotype.

Another effect of massive commercial exploitation of youth appears to be that the stereotype of youth, based on the select, visible, and active minority, served as a model (Bandura, op.cit.) which elicited a parade of youthful populism.[56] The analyses and idologies which the erudite political activists acquired from their parents, teachers and books were debased and transformed into cliches, slogans and other recipes which were easily digested by masses of pupils who had little comprehension of the sources, nature or merit of the original material. No political sophistication was required by those who rationalized their "ressentiment"[57] and "intrusiveness" (see Friedenberg, 1973) with assumptions like those that one such populist at Regina betrayed in a call to action:

> ...a creative learning environment (sic) does not exist in our present education system. Throughout school we lose [our] creative instincts towards learning (sic)...because of a master-slave relationship in the classroom (students are niggers)[58] and because of curriculum content which was largely irrelevant to the things affecting our lives outside the classroom. The basic nature of the school system is authoritarian, undemocratic, and anti-community...
>
> It is only once we have...a democratic community ...that we can...make changes...
>
> To do this we will have to begin by democratizing the classroom itself... (The Carillon, September 27, 1968, p.11).

---

[56] The term "populism" is used here to denote non-revolutionary criticism directed at "interests" and informed by ideas of an ad hoc sort but vaguely expressing a faith in the value of "freedom of opportunity" to "do one's own thing". The term also suggests an association of a better life with "getting back to the land" (on which all virtues flourish). The term, in addition, seems appropriate in that it suggests a tendency to see sinister conspiracies as the basis for explaining the conditions against which the criticisms and actions undertaken, are aimed. Manifest too, is a Luddite-like attitude towards technology and industrialization.

According to Lasch (1969, pp.5-9, 11-16) populists, unlike socialists, lack a conception of ideology: they do not attach "great importance to the way in which class interests take on the quality of objective reality so that the class basis of ideas is concealed both from (sic) those whose class interests they support and from those whom they aid in exploiting." Accordingly, populists tend to rely on "conspiratorial explanations of history"due to their lack of "awareness of the human capacity for self-deception" (p.7). Unlike the socialists who respect "the claims of a determinism which governs mental life" and who attack "the illusion of physic freedom" (which Freud called a "quite unscientific" belief) populists have generally attributed the creation of the People's problems to "personal interests", "conscious lies", "tyranny of organizations", "bureaucracy", "industrialization", or "technology". Accordingly, populists have tended to be confident that the required changes could be brought about without a "fundamental restructuring" of society.

[57] "Ressentiment", according to Friedenberg (1973) and Wolin (1974) is the term Nietzche used to denote "...the sense of impotence which drives the dominated to attack the values of their masters while secretly desiring to possess them" (ibid, p.10). Friedenberg (1973) discussed this phenomenon as "envy", "rancor", and "resentment" (see pp. 99-114, 123).Hacker (1970) also claimed that "envy" is "endemic" among those who are not distinguished by the possession of uncommon ability, influence (or power) or by accomplishment.

Perhaps one would not be indulging in wild speculation if one made the conjecture that such students were unfamiliar with considerations such as those which led Fromm (1968) to conclude that:

> We have to explain the educational system by the necessities resulting from the social and economic structure of a given society. ...We cannot explain the structure of society or the personality of its members by the educational process (p.314).

Unable to discriminate between the significant and silly, the important and spurious, the scholarly and the debased, the substantial and shoddy criticisms which were propounded everywhere, many young people apparently went to school with ideas and expectations like those Barr (op.cit.), Barzun (op.cit.) and Boorstin (op.cit.) called "extravagant". Since there was bound to be a mismatch between what they actually encountered and their illusory visions of what schools and teachers could and should be, disappointments, anger, frustrations, resentments and hostility could be expected (Bandura, 1969; Barzun, 1954; Berkowitz, 1972b; Geen, 1968; Schachter and Singer, 1962). This was especially probable when mass communications media made the intrusive model, implicitly applauded in the "pop" criticism and rhetoric, palpable (Bandura and Walters, 1963). For example, the Associated Press wire service carried the following report which at least one newspaper[59] printed under the headline "Call to mutiny for British Schoolchildren":

> British schoolchildren have been urged to rebel and sabotage their classrooms -- to unscrew locks, smash the public address systems, paint blackboards red and grind all chalk to dust.

---

[58] Brackets in the original.

[59] The Chronicle Herald (Halifax) December 11, 1971.

> The call to mutiny came in a new magazine called Children's Rights... A communique in the magazine signed by The Chldren's Angry Brigade also urged those who do not like school to play hookey. 'Why should you go to a school you don't like.' it asked...
>
> 'Education can damage your mind...'
>
> Three of the magazines editorial advisors are respected British educationalists: A.S. Neill head of Summerhill... author Leila Berg and Michael Duare, former head-master of Risinghill School...

Accounts such as this, can be models (Bandura, 1969; 1971, pp.8-10) which can instruct, disinhibit, and facilitate or elicit matching responses on the part of attentive, excitable, dependent, less effectual observers (Bandura and Walters, 1963). Similarly, the film footage and commentary used in television "news" programs which treated the political activism of so-called civil rights workers with sympathy, could have had similar effects. The active use of passivity and "creative disorder" (Buckman, 1970, p.104) was repeatedly shown to be instrumentally effective as a means of achieving ends. The successful campaigns for the inclusion of "Black Studies" in schools of various sorts and the numerous "victories" obtained on behalf of a great variety of causes (e.g. "free speech" at Berkeley and Simon Fraser) were widely filmed, televised, reported and publicized in other ways.[60]

With the dissemination of news of the first disruptions (e.g. Quebec 1958; Berkeley 1959; Notre Dame 1960; New York City College 1961; Southern University, Michigan State 1962; Indiana 1963; Yale, Berkeley 1964; Chicago, Berkeley, Michigan and many more 1965); with attention drawn to the role played by students in historic changes (e.g. Mill's (1960) identification of students and intellectuals as the "immediate, radical agency of change" and his citation of the central role played by the "young intelligensia" in important political changes in Turkey, South Korea, Japan and Cuba[61]); and with the publicity surrounding the first civil rights strife in the U.S.A. which involved students (e.g. see Feuer (1969a, pp.392-397) and Jacobs and Landau (1966, pp.322-333) re. Greensboro, Charlotte, Raleigh, Nashville, Montgomery and so forth in early 1960) mass media interests enabled student activism to be born and grow from exposure. With each report greater numbers were exposed to examples or models of potentially instrumental action (e.g. see The Gateway (November 8, 1968, p.8) Manitoba administration gives in; (November 22, 1968, p.1) Parity at Ottawa...occupation and blocade... secure pledge...). Accordingly, Sheffe (1970) eventually observed that "...instant communications...have brought the...unrest into every...town" (p.5). After people watched, read about or listened to reports of turmoil they would, if the events were rehearsed in discussion, have a greater

---

[60] Buckman (1970) has described the extent to which students who were able to sustain their activism depended upon propaganda about successes. As Bandura (1969, 1971) has shown, the probability of the reoccurence of a given behavior is increased not only when it has been instrumental for the actor (Skinner, 1953, 1971); but one who, observes the action and its instrumental effects may be affected similarly. That is, the observation of another's behavior and its consequences, affects the probability that the observer will reproduce the behavior which was observed. According to Buckman (op.cit.) the German students have been able to sustain their activism (e.g. see "Germany's new wave of student rebels", The Globe and Mail, March 9, 1973, p.7) due to an explicit recognition of the importance of monitoring the effects of actions (Buckman, op.cit., pp.207-208). In general, Buckman concluded that "without success to sustain it, any campaign loses support" (p.120). The CND for example, "could not hold on to the allegiance of the young without tangible successes, which it never attained" (p.125).

[61] Feuer (1969a) suggests that Castro- "an intellectual, a student leader [who] had galvanized the masses" (p.390) and led them through a successful revolution -- was embraced by student activists in 1960-1961 (with the encouragement of C.W. Mills) as an exemplary model.

chance to observe or participate in turmoil closer to home (Bandura and Jeffery, 1973). This mass media deployment of models may well account in part, for the fact that the political activists were eventually lost in a mass which was distinguishable mainly by its members' enthusiasm for "pop culture". Thus, Brogan (1974, p.22) was moved to make the following observation:

> The movement was chiefly made of romantic, well-meaning, ignorant, young [people]. They were pseudo-revolutionaries because, though they freely chucked Marxist terminology around, they had no programme..., they had no notion of the common sense of Marxism, let alone its philosophy: no notion that is, of Marx's insistance on rationality and emperical evidence. They knew no economics, no history, no sociology, no political science. In short, they were dillitantes.[62]

Dillitantes or pseudo-revolutionaries, however, can be and were troublesome; and they can and did extract changes. While genuine revolutionaries would agitate and demand changes that their adversaries are incapable of making (e.g. see Gray (1966); Lenin (1969)) "dillitantes" are more easily tamed. In response to disruption, school officials could and did, terminate their own turmoil (Kifner, 1969)[63] by instituting changes ("A lot of [which] changes that...prove soothing are...nonpolitical"; ibid. see Sheffe, 1970, p.42). However, every time turmoil was terminated in this manner and the mass media transmitted the "news", student observers in remote places were given vicarious encouragement to imitate (Bandura 1971, 1969; Bandura and Jeffery 1973; Bandura, Ross and Ross 1963a, b; Bandura and Walters 1963) the activists. The student observers learned that "many...changes came only after students had staged demonstration, sit-ins, or building seizures" (Kifner 1969, in Sheffe op.cit. p.43). At the same time, school officials learned that they could minimize their own troubles by answering student protesters with changes. Since these actions in turn, provided still other observers with lessons on how to get whatever one wants, turmoil spread and "student involvement and participation...dramatically increased" (ibid.). Turmoil at first confined (in the main) to higher quality universities, became common in very modest and obscure schools during the latter half of the 1960's. (For example, see The Carillon, December 6, 1968, p.2; "It's happening in Oshkosh[64] too!"). Furthermore, political content was not discernable in a large portion of these cases. (For examples see: The New York Times (February 7, 1971, p.65); The Ubyssey (November 14, 1969, p.20; January 30, 1970, p.8); The Gateway (November 22, 1968, p.1; December 4, 1970, p.3); The Varsity (January 28, 1970, p.1). At the same time, just as Divoky (1969b) predicted, even the public schools were disrupted. (For examples see: The Globe and Mail (March 15, 1973, pp. 8,43; May 3, 1973, p.9); The Carillon (October 11, 1968, pp.2,3,); The Daily (December 6, 1967, p.1; October 24, 1967, p.8; October 9, 1970, p.1); The Peak (March 15, 1967, p.3).

---

[62] H. Brogan, All over there. The Manchester Guardian May 11, 1974.

[63] J. Kifner, Colleges change to avert disruption. The New York Times May 11, 1969.

Surveys by the National Association of Secondary School Principals in the United States reported that 56 per cent of junior high schools were disrupted by May of the 1969 school year. The same organization's survey suggested that three out of five principals in U.S. high schools and junior high schools reported active protest in their schools during this period (New York Times, May 9, 1969) (see also Sheffe, pp.50-52). A Columbia University survey reporting on episodes of disorder in high schools during the period November 1968 to February 1969 gave a "conservative estimate" that 2000 high schools had "undergone disruptions" during that four month period. Furthermore, the disruptions increased three-fold from November through February (ibid. p.51).[65] A New York Times Survey reported that "there has been a high incidence of violence and police patrols at urban schools have become common" (ibid. p.51).

---

[64] Oshkosh is a town in Wisconsin where students at the local branch of the State University occupied the President's Office to back up demands for "courses in black culture". They were arrested and removed by police "from nine Fox River Valley cities".

Not only had the incidence of turmoil been transformed from one of anomaly to that of popular proportions; there was a qualitative change as well. Trachenberg (op.cit.) made a note of this change:

> ...the character of the student movement has... undergone a decisive change since its beginnings. It has become more invlusive in its aims and its membership...(Rosenberg and White, 1971, p.120).

A number of empirical studies, for example the Princeton Studies (see Peterson, 1968) supported this observation. Thus, The New York Times (May 9, 1969) reported that "...most protests...centre...around the growing effort for more student freedom and involvement in school policy" (Sheffe, op.cit., p.51).[66] A study by Trump and Hunt (New York Times, May 9, 1969) concluded that

---

[65] See also The Guardian (New York) May 7, 1969 and Buckman (1970) p.185.

[66] The New York Times (November 15, 1970, p.E7) reported that a study of turmoil in high schools by Havighurst indicated that "the most frequent issue" where trouble erupted was "dress and style such as length of hair or skirts". Other issues included demands for "lounges", "soul food", and "instructional programs".

> While dress and hair account for more protests than any other single topic, the [public school] principals enumerate many other regulations which students oppose. In fact, 82 per cent of the schools have protests against school regulations. (Sheffe, p.51)

Data in Peterson's (op.cit.) study suggest that while the more exclusive (by virtue of quality) institutions were most frequently disrupted by students involved in political issues, the less exclusive schools were most frequently visited with turmoil having to do with issues pertaining to "dormitory and other living group regulations e.g. womens hours"; "food service"; and "dress regulations" (p.18). In general, Peterson's (ibid) data indicate that between 1965 and 1968 there was an overall increase in the incidence of organized protest in all types of degree granting institutions in the U.S.A. At the same time there appeared to be a proliferation of precipitating "issues". Peterson (ibid), for example, listed 129 "issues" reported to him by officials at 859 colleges during 1967-8. Of the 129 issues Peterson (ibid, pp.18, 46) listed, only 24 were classified as "Off Campus Issues". Nineteen of the 24 were apparently new, i.e. not reported in 1964-65. Furthermore, in addition to the "issues" which were reported to precipitate turmoil in 1964-65, there appeared to be a very large increase of "on-campus issues": "... it was generally the issues, involving administration controls over the personal lives of students that [were] judged to have stirred the largest number of students" in 1968 (ibid, p.38). While only about four per cent of the students demonstrated or were otherwise activiated by political off-campus issues, nine per cent were estimated to have actively protested dormitory, dress and drinking regulations (ibid). Peterson concluded that while in 1968 "more colleges around the country experienced organized protest" than in 1965, and that there "most certainly" were more student activists in 1968 (pp.31-33) "substantially larger proportions of protesting students" were reported only in relation to issues having to do with the regulation of personal matters (p.39). While in 1965, there were 28% of the colleges disrupted over rules associated with in loco parentis control of personal conduct, by 1968 there had been an increase of nearly 25% (e.g. see p.12).

Furthermore, some students made unqualified and unsupported claims to justify activism. The New Republic, (April 5, 1969) quoted a document published by some high school students:

> The public schools...have critically negative and absolutely destructive effects on human beings and their curiosity, natural desire to learn, confidence, individuality, creativity, freedom of thought and self-respect. (Sheffe, p.49)

Like popular writers such as some of those Peter Schragg (1967) called "the romantic critics", some student protesters rejected an essential basis for the existence of educational institutions and practices. Toronto's Globe and Mail (July 12, 1969) quoted one such student:

> Our minds are manipulated, because the choices we are allowed are neither complete nor natural ...That's a limitation of choice. That's manipulation. And manipulation is much more dangerous than compulsion. Compulsion is obvious control. Manipulation is unobvious control...
>
> ...Scratch the majority of the students on any campus deeply enough and the same response is produced: no one is going to manipulate me (Sheffe, p.76).

Accordingly, students who were otherwise conservative, protested against the influence of others on their lives and attempted through direct action to procure an elusive autonomy. As The Peak (January 17, 1968) editors observed:

> You do not have to be a leftist to believe in democracy and the large majority of students taking part in most of the rallies and demonstrations are not leftist oriented.
>
> ...People like Stan Wong...who by no stretch of the imagination could be considered New Left...(were among those who) led the drive to have the board of governors reconsider firing the TAs. (Furthermore) both the Social Credit club and the Progressive Conservative club backed the threatened strike.
>
> ...Support for a more democratic university will still come from the average student (p.4).

That which Kozol[67] calls liberal society's "pretense" of "unmanaged intellection" and "unmanacled expression of ideas" have been taken as attainable and desirable goals by students who have demanded "individualized learning", "open-structured" or "non-directive" education in which they can "do their own thing". In the fashion of John Holt[68] these would-be students apparently believe they are self-sufficient and know what they need to know before knowing what there is to know (see Barzun, 1971; Brustein, 1969; Wallace, 1971). Like Ortega y Gasset's (1961, p.53) mass man, a protester of this genre accepts "the stock of commonplaces, prejudices, fag-ends of ideas or simply empty words which chance has piled up within his mind, and with a boldness...is prepared to impose them everywhere".

The extent of such activists' success may well be so great, that a state of affairs akin to that which Barzun[69] called "confusion by choice" apparently exists in large areas:[70]

---

[67] Kozol, The open schoolroom: new words for old deceptions. Ramparts, Vol.II, 1 (July) 1972, p.37.

[68] See Psychology Today July, 1972, p.4. In contrast, Barzun (1971) (see Wallerstein and Starr, vol.I, 1971, pp.126-127) responded to this sort of notion by observing that "If a student were (sic) in fact capable of framing a curriculum, then I would think he should be given a diploma, and not a voice because he would know everything for earning that diploma."

> All the fiddling with curriculum and scheduling at whatever level belongs under the same heading of escape by gimmickry; the unit, the module, the project, the field work...and that will-o-the-wisp, 'independent work' are almost without exception sops to restlessness...
>
> The confusion here is between the conditions of learning and those fancied as proper for a free citizen in an ideal world. For in the real world we have not yet got around to liberating the seats in buses and concert halls or removing the humiliating distinction between doctor and patient. On the contrary, alas the modern world is more intent than ever on classification, identification numbers, and credentials -- which is why undoubtedly, the school feels the counterblow in these various pleas for the aboriginal free-for-all. Confusion-bred nonsense fulfills itself in the nonsense of confusion by choice.[71]

The Decline of Turmoil

Perhaps a widespread acceptance (see Brustein, 1969; Worth, 1972; The New York Times December 10, 1972, p.E5; The Moncton Transcript May 14, 1973, p.12) of the "cafeteria curriculum" -- Holt's (1970a) "smorgasbord" -- has had the effect of a sop to restlessness. This acceptance and implementation may be one factor that was involved in the decline in the incidence of turmoil[72] (e.g. see: Kifner (1969); Open classrooms...

---

[69] J. Barzun, Confusion by choice. Education Nova Scotia 3, 6, (January 10) 1973, p.7.

[70] The New York Times (December 12, 1971, p.E7) reported that "there are 10 times as many American college students enrolled in astrology courses as in astro-physics..." (See also: The New York Times November 19, 1972, p.1; December 10, 1972, p.E5; and The Globe and Mail (February 17, 1973) "Teachers want return to compulsory high school courses").

[71] Education Nova Scotia 3, 6 (January 10) 1973, p.7.

cure-all...The Globe and Mail January 25, 1973, p.W8; Campuses quiet... The New York Times December 20, 1970, pp.1,37;Students had a quiet year on Canadian universities (sic) Edmonton Journal June 13, 1970, p.54) even though such tranquility may have been bought at the cost of sacrificing a solid education (Burstein 1969, in Wallerstein and Starr 1971, vol.I, p.550; also Barzun 1971; Wallace 1971). However, other factors probably played their parts in reducing turmoil as well.

One can with considerable confidence identify some of these factors. The dynamics of fashion and value in the economy comprise one of these. Like all novelties that are transformed into fashion (Poggioli, op.cit.) activism and turmoil eventually became so commonplace that they were no longer "newsworthy" early in the 70's.[73] At the same time, means for neutralizing activists and reducing or pre-empting turmoil had been discovered and refined.[74] Repression (Boffey, 1969) apparently played its part in reducing turmoil.[75] The New York Times (December 20, 1970, pp.1,37) for example, described the following rections and common

---

[72] In this case, the cost of packaging -- like that of much merchandise -- may be greater than the worth of the "goods" purchased. And if thought of as a palliative, the cure may be worse than the disease. (See The New York Times December 3, 1972, p.109 'Lag in reading scores blamed on teachers (who do not teach)'; The Globe and Mail 'Teachers want return to compulsory high school courses', February 17, 1973; The Edmonton Journal March 6, 1974, 'School system sued by...mother').

[73] The Canadian Press quoted one of Canada's student leader's explanation for the decrease in turmoil; "Students seem to require 'simultaneous explosions elsewhere' to get involved in their own issues" (Edmonton Journal June 13, 1970, p.54). The author of the same piece noted that all the major instances of turmoil in Canadian universities that took place in 1970, occurred at the same time (late March and early April).

[74] The New York Times December 20, 1970, pp.1,37).

[75] According to Bandura (1971, 1969) (also see Walters and Cheyne, 1972) repression should inhibit both those who directly experience punishment and those who observe the actor's behavior and the immediately consequent punishment. That is, the probability that either party will emit the behavior which was followed by the noxious stimuli should be decreased.

sentiments which one can associate with the observation of repression:

> confrontations last spring after the invasion of Cambodia and the killing of students at Kent State and Jackson State left [the students] drained... a little afraid.

Apparently liberal (reformist) students were particularly prone to these effects. Said one:

> Now that the Government has labeled the Left (sic) as the enemy...there's just the choice of going underground...Most of us can't even consider that type of choice. We're basically reformist and want to work through the system (ibid., p.37).

Sayre (1974, p.160) quoted another such student who, she claimed, describted a common reaction: "After Kent State [people said]: Goddam! I could get killed doing this." Furthermore, the basis for The New York Time's (December 20, 1970, pp.1,37) claim that school officials were "tightening security" and "taking a firm stand in dealing with disruptions" might be expected to discourage activism too. We saw the effects of this at both McGill University, in the spring and fall of 1969, and Simon Fraser University (see Chapter IV above). Those who observed such measures in Canada or knew that "large numbers...involved in violence have been expelled" (ibid) in the U.S.A., might be inclined to desist and "turn inward" to the well cultivated and ever-beckoning habit of self-indulgence, to concern with "life styles" (see Hadden, 1969). The New York Times (op.cit.) reported that "many dropped out".

In addition to the effects of repression, change in fashion, increased disinterest in news media, and the effects associated with the popular adoption of the "smorgasbord curriculum", there appears to be evidence of effects from an even more general pattern of cooptation than is involved in the cafeteria curriculum. Again The New York Times (December 20, 1970, pp.1,37) found that "the more progressive schools have removed

...issues by yielding to a wide range of student demands" the objects of which were abolition or alteration of regulations having to do with living arrangements and other personal matters. Furthermore, ROTC was abolished in many schools; "Black Studies" have been added; course offerings and student choices of them have been broadened; and committee and board memberships have been extended to include students. The overall effect was summarized by a student who was quoted as follows:

> There are a few issues left...The administration is giving us what we want...They're taking all the steam out of issues (ibid).

There is evidence of the effects of still other factors on the decline of activism and turmoil. Certainly, the "reform" of the draft laws had their effects in the USA (ibid; Sayre, 1974). And the reduced threat of direct personal involvement in the South-east Asian wars made it easier for some to convince themselves (however inappropriately) that the war was over and was, therefore, no longer a matter of importance. For those who were less ignorant however, fatigue (ibid, p.169) and loss of confidence which accompanied the observation of the depletion of their ranks in the face of the adaptations by and toughness of "the system", made private pleasures seem more attractive. Those without a program were particularly prone to this "option". Sayre (1974) referred to students of this type when she wrote: "The real failure of the left was not having a program. But kids can't provide that, they've no experience" (p.169). Those who lacked sufficient commitment to a program; those who were offended by fratricidal feuds; those who rationalized drug usage with confusions of nirvana and revolution or "the occult" and politics, may have been particularly susceptible to the message in the "crunch" of "recession". The liberal fantasies about a "post-scarcity society", a a "post-industrial society", a "leisure society", an "identity society", an "ecstatic society" or any one of the manifold others (whether de-schooled or otherwise) which were mass produced during the 1960's,must have taken on the appearance of the preposterous when "the sad facts of the economy" delivered personal pinches (Sayre 1974, p.145; The New York Times December 20, 1970, p.37). In a pecuniary society, money is the easiest way of saying no to everything.

When the Weatherpeople, Panthers, Felquistes, and the like are reported to be in jail, or in exile, or in peril as fugitives; as mass media "insistence the movement was declining" (Sayre, 1974, p.392) was made credible by the disappearance of "old" celebrity models, there may have been an inclination for some to withdraw and "try" something else, something "new". As one Harvard student, who was quoted by The New York Times (December 20, 1970, p.37) observed:

> People who get into Harvard...are used to being winners...They tried their hands at politics and they didn't win...Then they withdrew from politics altogether...

Kozol (1973) observed and was frustrated with this type of phenomenon. He called this a "movin' on" syndrome which consisted of young people moving from one imcompletion to another as fashions changed or instrumental effects were not quickly forthcoming. According to Kozol (ibid) the young people he had in mind typically got "into" communes, then moved "into" revolution, then ecology; thereafter co-ops or daycare or women's liberation, yoga and so forth. (Note: the order given here is not significant; nor does it represent an actual sequence). Frequently, connections were not made; and perseverance which is rarely associated with the behavior of dilettantes, was never seen. If desirable results were not immediately forthcoming from whatever the young shopper was "into", he or she moved on to the next aisle. And of course, as one disillusioned student said "you can be 'into' daycare or 'into' food co-ops, to the exclusion of other things -- including human pain" (Sayre, 1974, p.138).

Since evidence (e.g. Eitzen 1972-1973, p.547; Erbe 1964, p.198) suggests that there is a tendency for the more highly educated and economically privileged to be, with respect to politics, more "interested", informed, articulate, expressive, active, consistent and persistent than those with lower educational and economic status, it may not be inappropriate to infer that those who Kozol (op.cit.) observed "movin' on", were primarily those of the mass whose activism was non-political or at best only marginally or superficially political. The attrition from activist ranks that one might expect with the passage of time (student status being rather definite and transient) was probably exaggerated when activism which was not informed by a coherent set of political ideas, became ineffectual[76] (failed to produce instrumental effects) was punished, was co-opted (e.g. was displaced by tedious committee work) was ignored by the mass media and was deprived of highly visible, attractive, prestigious, expressive, assertive and successful models.[77]

---

[76] Zald and Ash (1966) emphasize the importance of "purposive incentives" (goal attainment, "value fulfillment") in maintaining a person's commitment and active participation in a movement organization. Their absence or removal tends to produce inactivity and disaffiliation. Adjustments by school people who anticipated turmoil, may have frequently pre-empted turmoil by virtue of the fact that the adjustments removed such incentives. (see Kifner, op.cit.; Sayre, op.cit.; The New York Times, December 20, 1970, op.cit.)

[77] Such models tend to be imitated by observers who are attentive, aroused, ineffectual, introverted and possess an imitative set (they have been reinforced for imitation in the past) and low self-esteem (Bandura and Walters, 1963).

The less common and more politicized activists who initially comprised the models for the non-political activists (and who apparently acquired their ideas and political activism from their parents and the other models provided by books and intellectuals with whom both parents and off-spring associated) became "convinced that the campuses [were] no longer fertile grounds for organization" (The New York Times, December 20, 1970, pp.1,37) (see also Sayre, op.cit., and Chapter IV, above). Accordingly, they withdrew in "large numbers" (ibid) to do political work in the wider community, or in other less "newsworthy" occupations. The places they once filled in the mass media were immediately occupied by new images and models: those "personalities" who embodied and were reinforced for being champions of "the new romanticism" or "the new nostalgia" and the like. The acquisition of families and attendant financial obligations and demands (which also quite reliably appear when one's schooling ends) also conspired to remove the attractive elite models (whose political activism inspired and sustained imitation behavior in others as they were exploited and exposed by mass media) from places of high visibility. Accordingly, we observe the coming of full circle -- a return to the 1950's -- as "greasers" replace the Bordos who now sell insurance, the Conways, Oglesbys and many others who are now academics, the Loneys who are civil servants, the Hardings who farm, the Haydens who entertain, the Prices who work as professionals for minority groups or single "causes", and so on. Like their non-political imitators, most of the political activists we have studied now "participate" and are "involved" in the political economy of democracy, mass culture and the values which at one time elicited their active resistance.

The criticisms and actions of the elite politicos were assimilated because they had use -- value in the commercial apparatus of mass culture.

Values could be and were sold; careers, reputations and other advantages could be, and were, built and gained, in the process. But, as Arendt (op.cit.) suggested, the original elements, the criticism and political activism were "transformed into values" -- exchange values -- and in the processes of circulation, exchange, popularization and fashion creation, they were "worn down like an old coin" (ibid, p.96). Eventually, as the intellectual superstructure, the critical ideas which made political activism's political character salient and manifest, was worn off, the behavioral base was cheapened, and, in time, made worthless (mutatis mutandis).

What then, may we conclude with respect to the learning of social behavior, in particular political activism, in the context of a political economy of mass culture? This is the major question which is addressed in the following pages which comprise the final chapter of this dissertation.

In the following chapter then, a review of pertinent social learning research is followed by a general summary of the etiology of the activism which we have examined. At the same time, the features of the political economy which were manifest and seem to be the plausible mechanisms which enabled the social learning principles to be operative in the etiology of activism are identified and described in relation to both the social learning principles and activism. From this integration, a number of interrelated propositions are derived which comprise, in general, some bases for a theory of political behavior and, in particular, some rudiments of a theory of educational turmoil.

CHAPTER VI

THE LEARNING OF POLITICAL AND OTHER SOCIAL BEHAVIOR IN THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF MASS CULTURE: ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY

Some Difficulties in the Realm of Theory and a Possible Path to Their Resolution

While observing activism spread during the preliminary stages of the present study, a set of phenomena were observed by the present writer which sociologists and others commonly associate with the notion of contagion, and to which psychologists make reference with terms such as identification, imitation, observational learning and social learning (Bandura 1971, 1969; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Berkowitz 1972, 1972b; Conger, 1973; Freud, 1965 (1933); Grinder, 1973). Observations made subsequent to the preliminary work have tended to support the hypothesis that social learning principles have been operative in the etiology of activism. However, since the present work was not conceived to be, or include, an experiemtnal attempt to falsify such hypotheses, we are forced by the nature of this study to rely on the evidence presented herewith, and the evidence of previously published studies from which we can, with risk, make pertinent inferences. In following this approach, a set of plausible propositions may be provided which might suggest studies that attempt to falsify derivative hypotheses through the use of experimental procedures and statistical controls.

However, one must acknowledge that the reliability and validity of such experimental or correlational studies depend upon the possibility that some of the conditions, relations, and events which are related to activism and turmoil in the propositions provided below, will persist or be repeated. And Gergen (1973,1974) has argued that the possibilities for delineating principles of human interaction which retain validity over time are severely limited. "Social psychology" argues Gergen (1973, p.310)"is primarily an historical inquiry". As such, "it deals with facts that are nonrepeatable and fluctuate markedly over time" (ibid). Those of us who undertake social psychological studies then, "are essentially engaged in a systematic account of contemporary affairs" (ibid, p.316). And while these accounts may be useful to future historians who "... may look back to such accounts to achieve a better understanding of life in the present era..." (ibid), the principles we might develop in the present will be, in Gergen's (ibid, p.317) view, probably of "little... value" for "the psychologists of the future" since "the facts on which they are based do not generally remain stable" (ibid, p.310)[1]. Accordingly, argues Gergen (1974, p.183)

> ...any attempt to categorize or conceptualize a given behavioral activity runs grave risks. The major problem is that behavior may remain phenotypically similar over time, but undergo rapid genotypical modification.

---

[1] Gergen (1973, p.309) argues that "the dissemination of psychological knowledge modifies the patterns of behavior upon which the knowledge is based". Accordingly, today's knowledge becomes tomorrow's misinformation since "reactions are created" by the communication of knowledge and concepts utilized in describing and explaining phenomena. Such communication "...may thus create homogeneity with respect to behavioral indicators" (ibid, p.311). Furthermore, problems of measurement arise "if subjects possess preliminary knowledge as to the theoretical premises" (ibid, p.313). For then "we can no longer adequately test our hypotheses". If the subject is psychologically informed, the theories about which he is informed become "difficult to test in an uncontaminated way" (ibid, p.313). Furthermore, "if we rely on the language of the culture for scientific communication, it is difficult to find terms regarding social interaction that are without prescriptive value" (ibid, p.312).

> [Hence] ... the most we can expect from historical analysis, or, in fact, any form of systematic observation, is an enhanced sensitivity to _possible_ determinants of present day behavior.

This is, indeed, a powerful and pursuasive argument against the possibility of gaining a thorough understanding and predictive precision, with respect to activism, from social psychological experimentation and/or historical analysis. All manner of things do change; and the acquisition of information or knowledge can alter (or contribute to the change) of human behavior (Bandura, 1971). The self-fulfilling prophecy (Bandura 1964; Conger 1973; Grinder 1973; Musgrove 1964a,b) illustrates these virtually unassailable assertions nicely.

However, Bowers (1973) has suggested that contemporary social psychology, in confining itself to the investigation of situational variables (very specific, easily manipulated, very accessible, readily contrived factors) in laboratory settings, has limited itself unduly. Such observations with respect to the limitations of what Bowers (_ibid_) calls "situationism", may indicate a pathway out of the difficulties which Gergen (_op.cit._) has described so well. If social psychology includes a body of knoweldge, a set of principles and practices and a set of concerns which are compatible, and can be integrated, with the knowledge, concepts, practices and concerns of practitioners in other disciplines which are not so ahistorical and situation-bound, social psychology might, in an integration or synthesis with the same, gain vitality and become less moribund. In other words, social psychologists might then begin to observe and base their principles and theories on more persistent, less situation-specific, and perhaps more important phenomena than has been common heretofore. With considerations such as these in mind, one might contemplate the following notions which may help us carry the burden which Gergen's (op.cit.) argument places on us.

First, the possession of knowledge or information, in some conditions and relations, may not constitute a sufficient condition for the occurence of behavior change. A child or worker, for example, may acquire or possess knowledge of his or her dependent and relatively powerless (viz a viz a parent or employer) condition and remain incapable of altering the facts of that condition which order his or her behavior. Furthermore, while all things may change, many changes that occur are insignificant ("plùs ca change, plùs c'est la meme chose"). The worker, for example, may alter some of the details of his relationship with his employer through negotiation and still remain dependent on his employer: in the long term he still must work. Similarly, the particular expectations which people possess with respect to schools or teachers may change over time; yet the new expectations which replace the old, are often like the old: extravagant (e.g. see Barzun, 1954; Hofstadter, 1963). Or, a person may acquire the knowledge that the consequences of his behavior affect the probability of the recurrence of his behavior. He may then alter his behavior but subsequently revert to behavior similar to but not identical with his previous behavior -- perhaps because he does not possess the power to control the consequences (e.g. see Skinner, 1953,1971; Thoreson and Mahoney, 1974). Sometimes teachers and psychologists encounter similar problems; they may know what conditions maintain given behavior patterns but lack access to or power to change the critical conditions (e.g. see Bandura, 1969). And even though the appearance or details of the facts of these critical conditions may change (perhaps to the point where the conditions may themselves seem to have changed) the condition may persist.[2]

Even as our gains in knowledge of life processes allow us to postpone death, to transcend the historical boundaries of our previous knowledge, to alter certain conditions previously associated with death; the fact of death itself persists just as the facts of childhood and worker dependence persist in spite of the fact that some of the details of that condition have been altered over time. Indeed, some facts -- some conditions and relations -- for example, the capitalist mode of production and social relations, have perhaps persisted because certain details or subordinate facts were changed (e.g. see Laski, 1962; Macpherson, 1965; and Chapters III and V above).

Accordingly, it may not be inappropriate to assert, notwithstanding Gergen's (op.cit.) argument, that one may through historical and experimental studies establish principles of social behavior which maintain explanatory power and predictive precision over time -- beyond the

---

[2] One could argue that (contrary to the popular notion which suggests that present difficulties which people suffer are the consequences of alleged "social changes" of great magnitude which continue to be manifested at a rapidly accelerating rate) our present and anticipated problems (of war, famine, uneven distribution of wealth and power, illiteracy, ignorance, waste, shortages, unemployment, exploitation, depression, and so forth) are old, persistent, essentially stable facts which attend a lack of basic change or at least insufficient and very slow and insignificant changes in their precipitating conditions. Ignorance of history, propaganda about very "rapid and accelerating social change" (a very ambiguous notion which, as it is commonly used, hides important distinctions between, for example, technological changes, population growth and movement, and changes in social relations and social institutions -- in addition to those of family and learning) together with mystifying fantasies about "future shock", allegedly revolutionary changes that have occurred, powerful bureaucratic bogey men and so forth, may well have hidden the fact that some basic economic and social conditions and relations which were established several hundred years ago persist. In short, lack of basic changes in institutionalized and long established social relations (and the economic conditions which order them) may well be far more problematical than the allegedly great magnitude and rapid rate of "social change" about which we hear so much.

"historical boundaries" which enclose the observations of facts upon which they are based -- to the extent that (1) the independent variables, the precipitating relations, conditions, objects and events, persist or are in form or critical features, repeatedly manifested; and (2) knowledge of the patterns of influence to which the principles refer, does not affect the patterns and principles.

Gergen (1974) himself, acknowledges that many of the conditions and "issues" which "underlie" activism remain with us. Furthermore, biology and necessity frequently conspire to reduce freedom to an abstraction and make knowledge ornamental and impotent. The persistence of some conditions and relations in circumstances which otherwise vary (as change occurs) and the inability to use "psychological knowledge" even as it is possessed, may enable some principles of human interaction to endure.

Accordingly, an examination of some principles of social learning which have been delineated, which have survived experimental attempts to falsify them, and which have been observed in operation in a variety of circumstances, might now be appropriate. For these principles, together with a number of persisting conditions which are subsequently reviewed, suggest a set of propositions from which a more formal theory of activism and other social behavior may be developed.

Some Social Learning Principles and Research

Since the late 1950's, Bandura (1971, 1969) and his first doctoral student, Walters, (Bandura and Walters 1963, Walters and Cheyne, 1972) together with others (e.g. Bandura and Jeffrey 1973; Bandura, Ross and Ross 1963a,b; Berkowitz 1964, 1972, 1972b; Walters, Parke and Crane 1965; Walters and Parke 1964) have amassed impressive empirical evidence which demonstrates that behavior can be modified not only by classical or respondent conditioning, operant or instrumental conditioning, extinction procedures, discrimination training and counterconditioning but through observational learning or modeling as well. This type of behavior change which Bandura and Walters (1963) call observational learning or social learning

> is generally labeled 'imitation' in experimental psychology and 'identification' in theories of personality. Both concepts however, encompass the same behavioral phenomenon, namely, the tendency for a person to reproduce the actions, attitudes, or emotional responses exhibited by real-life or symbolized models (p.89).

The experimental and cross-culture investigations of this phenomenon (e.g. see Bandura and Walters, 1963) have convincingly demonstrated the importance of modeling influences in learning and social behavior just as they have advanced our understanding of these processes. Bandura (1971, p.11) was thus moved to make the following assessment:

> Research findings, considered together, disclose that modeling influences can serve as teachers, as inhibitors, as disinhibitors, as response elicitors, as stimulus enhancers, and as emotional arousers.

Indeed, Bandura (ibid, p.2) claims that "virtually all learning phenomena" which are a consequence of "direct experiences" can be produced vicariously "through observation of other people's behavior and its consequences for them".

Impressed by the demonstrated importance of response consequences which operant or instrumental learning investigators (see Skinner 1953, 1971) emphasize, Bandura and his associates accept the latter's conception of psychological functioning as a dialectical process -- "a continuous reciprocal interaction between behavior and its controlling conditions" (Bandura, 1971, p.2). However, those who associate themselves with

Bandura's social learning theory, depart from the practices of "radical" behavior theorists like Skinner (op.cit.) in giving "special emphasis" to vicarious, symbolic and self-regulatory processes (Bandura 1971, p.2). In Bandura's (ibid) view "traditional behavioral theories" could be faulted to the extent that they provided an "incomplete rather than an inaccurate account of human behavior" (ibid). Accordingly, the contemporary social learning theorists emphasize the role of cognition (also subject to the influences of consequences; ibid, p.3) in the three interrelated processes (vicarious, symbolic and self-regulatory) which together with "directly experienced response consequences" comprise in Bandura's (1971) formulation, the means by which behavior is controlled.

Before examining some of the specific conclusions which these social learning researchers have drawn with respect to the dynamics of social behavior, a second, preliminary, and pertinent comparison is in order. This comparison is between the Bandura and Walters (1963) treatment of personality development on the one hand and the orthodox assumptions and formulations which were identified and associated with psychodynamic and developmental theories and which were criticized by Inkeles and Levinson (1969) (see Chapter II above).

In psychodynamic and developmental theories one usually encounters a series of assumptions which Bandura and his associates question. Implicitly and at times explicitly, Bandura and Walters (1963) reject the orthodox view which in its various forms, suggests that more or less permanent personality traits (which together are assumed to comprise the personality) are formed from prototypical adaptations that are made when developmental tasks (with their accompanying crises) are encountered in childhood. Bandura and Walters (ibid) also object to the stage theories' emphases on intraindividual variability in behavior over time and interindividual similarities at specific age periods. With respect to the latter, Bandura and Walters (ibid, p.24) suggest that it might be more appropriate to "lay stress on interindividual differences and on intraindividual continuities". After all, they argue (ibid) biological, socioeconomic, ethnic and cultural differences which are often obvious and marked, produce demonstrable and correspondingly marked interindividual variability in behavior. Since the people which make up the population of any age level come from diverse backgrounds, experience different reinforcement contingencies and are exposed to widely differing social models, there are bound to be "marked...differences at any age level" (ibid). At the same time, Bandura and Walters (ibid) "expect a good deal of intraindividual continuity in behavior at successive age periods" since the biological, familial and cultural" factors that partly determine an individual's social-training experiences are likely to remain relatively constant throughout much of his earlier life". However, should "abrupt alterations in social training and other relevant biological or environmental variables" occur, Bandura and Walters (1963, p.25) would "predict marked changes in the behavior of an individual of a given age". Nevertheless, such alterations in Bandura and Walters (ibid) view, "rarely occur in the social-learning histories of most individuals during pre-adult years". For just as was indicated by the studies cited in chapters II and IV above, "continuity of behavior is more evident than discontinuity" (Bandura and Walters 1963, p.26). However, when such abrupt alterations in a person's behavior do occur, they are not regressions, neuroses, abnormalities, and so forth according to Bandura and Walters (ibid), but changes in habits which are probably connected with changes in reinforcement contingencies and/or the observation of models such as those which are televised. Bandura (1971, p.10) for example, claims that televised and other mass media models may have decreased the influence of "parents, teachers, and other traditional role models". The "large amount of time that people spend watching televised models" compared to the time spent in observing more traditional models may have made mass media more influential "in shaping behavior and social attitudes" (ibid). Bandura and Walters (1963) describe this possible source of behavior change as follows:

> ...mass media are, at the present time, extremely influential sources of social behavior patterns. Because of the amount of time during which most young people are exposed to pictorially presented models, mainly through television...such models play a major part in shaping behavior and in modifying social norms and thus exert a strong influence on the behavior of children and adolescents. Consequently, parents are in danger of becoming relatively less influential as role models...(p.49).

Accordingly, this social learning conception of personality development consists of processes of habit acquisition and modification which processes produce intraindividual continuity in behavior only insofar as the individual's reinforcement contingencies, associations and social models remain stable. However, inasmuch as these influences change, so does the person's behavior ergo personality. Thus the assumptions of psychoanalytic and conventional developmental theories with respect to trait formation, stages and so forth are rejected by Bandura and his associates (e.g. ibid, p.37). Since Bandura et.al. expect behavior to covary with the conditions of which it is a function (e.g. see Bandura, 1969) these social learning theorists (in contrast to the orthodox developmental and psychodynamic theorists) can explain post-childhood "personality" or character changes which might occur during adolescence or adulthood on the basis of changes in the interactions through which the person and his world operate on and condition one another at those times. Although dependency and imitation are linked in both theories, the social learning researchers are not as imprisoned as are orthodox developmentalists by presuppositions about the primacy and enduring effects of childhood dependency and imitation (compared with possible adult ineffectuality, powerlessness and imitation of others who are more powerful). "External stimulus elements, which...play the role of important discriminative cues" (Bandura and Walters 1963, p.56) are favored by the social learning theorists over internalized traits based on childhood prototypical adaptations as the basis of response acquisition in the social learning analysis.

Accordingly, Bandura and his associates have conducted experiments which have demonstrated that not only is human behavior controlled by its direct consequences, but it is similarly influenced by the observed consequences which attend the behavior of others (Bandura 1971, 1969) and the anticipation of future consequences as well. The differential consequences which accompany the actor's behavior, when observed by the actor, comprise "informative feedback" which is the basis of the "thoughts or hypotheses about the types of behavior most liekly to succeed. These hypotheses then serve as guides for future actions ..." (Bandura 1971, p.3).[3] Thus, Bandura appears to treat cognitions as a special class of operants when he writes:

---

[3] This suggests that Bandura, like Freud, Fromm, Marx, Piaget and other notable thinkers sees overt behavior as a basis which conditions the covert superstructure of thought. That is, one's thoughts have a basis in ones behavior and its differential consequences. And just as the thoughts or rules which Marxists claim develop from social practice in turn, guide and condition further practice (praxis) so Bandura's "anticipations" and "hypotheses" or "thoughts" (about the type of behavior most likely to succeed) serve as guides to future actions (Bandura 1971,p.3).

> Accurate hypotheses give rise to successful performances, whereas erroneous ones lead to ineffective courses of action. The cognitive events are thus selectively strengthened...by the differential consequences accompanying the more distally occuring overt behavior (ibid).

Man's cognitive capacity which enables him to represent his own actions and their differential consequences also enables him to not only remember which of his own actions have been instrumentally effective: he can represent, remember and rehearse symbolically the actions of those he observes and the consequences of their actions as well. Thus, external influences, (relations, conditions, objects and events) which are entailed in problems can be represented symbolically; and such representational activity enables a person to solve problems covertly without the person having to enact the various alternatives overtly. In Bandura's (1971, p.3) words, these "higher mental processes permit both insightful and foresigntful behavior [and make] man...capable of creating self-regulative influences". This cognitive capacity also permits a person to form new patterns of behavior through (1) covert organization of constituent responses into new patterns (2) representation and rehearsal of observed actions which have never been performed by the observer, and (3) the decoding, representation and rehearsal of novel actions which are represented in the symbol systems of books, musical composition and so forth. In short, man's cognitive capacity enables him to learn some behavior before he attempts to perform it overtly. Bandura (1971, p.9) claims that "observational learning without performance is abundantly documented in modeling studies using a nonresponse acquisition procedure ..."[4]

According to Bandura (1971) the tendency of observer behavior to be modified through vicarious or observational processes is dependent upon attentional processes, reproductive capabilities and reinforcement contingencies. The probability that observers will emit matching responses then, is affected by the extent to which the observers (1) are attentive to a model's behavior and consequences; (2) anticipate instrumental effects to accrue to themselves as a consequence of their reproduction or inhibition of the observed action; (3) are capable of reproducing the observed behavior; (4) are attentive to the appropriate cues; and (5) code and covertly rehearse the observed sequence of behavior (ibid).

Available evidence (see Bandura 1971; 1969; Bandura and Walters 1963) suggests the following additional conclusions with respect to social learning:

First, as Bandura (1971, p.9) suggests

> Anticipation of reinforcement [influences] what is observed and what goes unnoticed. Knowing that a given model's behavior is effective in producing valued rewards or averting negative consequences can enhance observational learning by increasing observers' attentiveness to the model's actions.

Furthermore "anticipated reinforcement can stregthen retention" of what has been observed by "motivating people to code and to rehearse modeled responses that have high value" (ibid). And as Bandura and Jeffrey (1973) have shown, coding and rehearsal activities increase the probability that observers will emit matching responses.

---

[4] The studies to which Bandura refers indicate that observers who watch models perform novel responses can later describe the observed patterns with considerable accuracy and "they often achieve errorless behavioral reproductions on the first test trial" (ibid, p.9). Accordingly, Bandura claims that "people can learn through modeling before they perform" (Bandura 1971, p.9).

Evidence (e.g. Bandura and Walters 1963) indicates that related model and observer characteristics which affect the occurrence of vicarious learning help explain this phenomenon of selective attention and the effects of the same. Thus observers who are dependent and who are relatively ineffectual tend to imitate models who possess rewarding power and who are observed and/or reputed to be more competent and successful (in procurring the reinforcers which their imitators have been relatively ineffectual in procurring for themselves). Highly visible, physically attractive, prestigious, successful, aggressive (expressive, assertive and/or coercive) models who are perceived by observers to be similar to themselves in personally significant ways and who are observed and/or are reputed to be recipients of social and other reinforcers (entailed in public attention, popularity, admiration, praise, sex and so forth) tend to be imitated. Evidence (ibid; Bandura 1969) suggests that those who imitate such models are those who are attentive, dependent, relatively ineffectual, emotionally labile persons who have been reinforced in the past for imitating the less introverted models described above and who are surrounded by others who are attentive and eagerly receptive to the model (e.g. see Bandura and Walters, 1963, p. 81-89; 94-96; 177-179; also Bandura 1969; Berkowitz 1972, 1972b; Geen 1968; Geen and O'Neal, 1969; Gusfield, 1970; McLaughlin, 1969; Milgram and Toch, 1969). However, while "both model characteristics and observer characteristics may...enhance the efficacy of a model for inducing imitative responses" (Bandura and Walters 1963, p.85) the characteristics of models and observers enumerated in the composite descriptions given above need not all be present for the occurence of imitation. For example, "generalized matching behavior can occur...even when the model exhibits responses that usually incur social disapproval" (ibid). Still other studies suggest the same. Thus in some experiments (ibid) students who were initially dissimilar to a deviant model tended to imitate the model's deviant behavior when the model was verbally represented as similar to the students in personal characteristics (ibid, p.86). The instrumental effects of the models actions seem to be critical. Accordingly, Bandura and Walters (ibid, p.82) observe that the "consequences to a deviant model...influence...the extent to which his deviant behavior will be imitated". Similarly, the same investigators report that while "aggressive responses...were readily imitated regardless of the nurturant quality of the model" (ibid, p.96) "success of the model's behavior is a crucial factor in determining the degree to which an aggressive pattern of behavior will be reproduced by the observer..." (ibid, p.103).

Observations with respect to differences in effects which have been found to be associated with different "forms" (Bandura, 1971, e.g. p.7) of models are pertinent as well. Just as "real-life" models vary in the extent to which they attract attention and evoke imitation (those persons who possess qualities which are, because of the observer's conditioned associational preferences, thought of as attractive, interesting, or winsome are sought out whereas those who lack pleasing characteristics tend to be ignored) so do symbolic models. Among the various forms which are used to represent live actions or behavior -- from "life-like" motion pictures with sound tracks through television, animated film, sequences of still photographs or drawings, to oral or written verbal descriptions or instructions -- one can discern differences in the frequency of peoples observational experiences, their associational preferences, and their decoding skills. And just as with real-life models, one is more likely to attend to and imitate those models which are encountered regularly, observed repeatedly and are evaluated favorably. Thus those who do not read are unlikely to be influenced by printed ideas, whereas those who read a great deal have less opportunity to observe other types of models, for example on television. If televised models are observed more frequently and for greater time spans than are literary models, one can expect that one will encounter imitations of the patois, manners and other behavior associated with "sit-coms", medicine shows and police stories, more frequently than their counterparts which are modeled in the works of the most popular writers -- to say nothing of Shakespeare or Marx, Pascal or Lenin, Tolstoy or Trotsky, Russell or Fanon, Cervantes or Guevara. Moreover, there is some reason to suppose that the more closely the symbolic model approximates an actual performance with respect to its clear depiction of relevant cues, the greater is the "rate and level of learning" (Bandura and Walters, 1963, p.50). These qualities, together with television's ubiquity, the modesty of demands it makes on the viewer and other characteristics probably conspire to make televised models particularly influential. Says Bandura (1971, p.7):

> Some forms of modeling are so intrinsically rewarding that they can hold the attention of people of all ages for extended periods. This is nowhere better illustrated than in televised modeling. Indeed, models presented in televised form are so effective in capturing attention that viewers learn the depicted behavior regardless of whether or not they are given extra incentives to do so...

Observations which have been made with respect to symbolic conditioning (see Chapter IV above) may help explain why televised modeling might be "intrinsically rewarding" and influential. Bandura (ibid, p.13) reminds us that conditioning principles would have more limited explanatory power "if emotional responses could be established only through direct physical experiences". The strong emotional responses which people commonly exhibit with respect to phenomena with which they have had no personal contact are, according to Bandura (ibid) "frequently developed on the basis of higher processes in which symbolic stimuli that have acquired positive or negative valence through direct association with primary experiences serve as the basis of further conditioning".

Words which elicit emotional arousal "can be effectively used" (ibid) to create new emotional associations (fear, desires, hatreds and so forth). Significant alterations of preexisting evaluative responses toward well known persons and states have been produced through the use of words which are emotionally loaded in conditioning procedures (ibid). Furthermore, "evluative responses occur not only toward objects singled out for conditioning, but they also tend to generalize along established associative networks..." (ibid). Since, as we have seen above (Chapter IV), television is used primarily to sell commodities and services through the association of those "values" with references to and images of primary and generalized reinforcers, one might expect that one of the cumulative effects of the viewing process would be that attending behaviors would be maintained by the reinforcing qualities of words and pictorial stimuli which have positive affective properties. Since such words and images are used to condition positive emotional responses to product names, images and modeled usage, the television itself might be expected to acquire positive evaluative reactions from the viewer through incidental classical conditioning.

In summary, social learning researchers have demonstrated that man's capacity to learn by observation enables him to acquire, through attending to exemplary models "large, integrated units of behavior". Similarly, emotional responses can be modified through vicarious means: by observing the emotional reactions of others, one's own feelings can be altered. Fears and inhibitions can be extinguished if the fearful or inhibited person observes others engage in the fear evoking or inhibiting activity without adverse consequences befalling the model. Moreover, inhibitions can be acquired when an observer sees others punished for their actions.

Finally, ideas and affective responses can be acquired from the observation of models -- especially visible, attractive, expressive, assertive, successful, prestigious and powerful models who receive and control or are associated with phenomena which are desired by the observer.

With these social learning principles in mind, we may now analyse the development of activism through a summary account of turmoil within the context of the mass or consumer culture and the political economy which creates it.

Activism and Turmoil: Summary and Analysis

In the present study, we have observed that activism and turmoil were, in the late 1950's and early 1960's, anomalies. The activists at first appear to have been comprised of tiny elites. They tended to be the sons and daughters of parents who were generally wealthier, better educated, politically and culturally critical, articulate, expressive and deviant in a progressive direction. The intellectual, aesthetic and political interests of the early activists' parents seem to have been reproduced in their offspring who generally regarded their highly nurturant parents with affection and esteem. Since the more highly educated and economically privileged have been found to be over-represented among those who are politically informed, articulate and active (Eitzen, 1972-1973; Erbe 1964) and the social learning research suggests that dependents of parents such as these would be inclined to imitate these powerful, successful, expressive parents, we can propose that social learning within the families of early political activists contributed to the development of the activism of the small élites who were politically active. The acquisition of intellectual skills whose excercise was probably reinforced both at home and in schools could be expected to enable such students to observe symbolic (verbal) models (e.g. in print) both at home and in universities, which would extend the range of behaviors which could be observed and matched. These models together with the eliciting cues inherent in "accidents" such as the first "sit-in" or in televised models of figures like Russell whose Ghandian adaptations, prestige and other qualities associated with the elicitation of imitation, also appear to the present writer as important contributing ingredients.

The verbal models also enabled such students to see, label and be aroused by conditions, arrangements and events which, by virtue of the symbols and networks of associations that inhere in the terms of critical ideas, would be perceived as noxious (e.g. see Bandura 1971; Staats and Staats 1957, 1958). Accordingly, students who had in the past been reinforced for and had also observed others produce instrumental effects by similarly operating on conditions which were unsatifying or unpleasant (rather than withdrawing) could be expected to generalize this mode of adaptation to newly discovered problems. When successful models like Castro and Che made the Mills - Marcuse appointment of the young intelligensia as the agents of change plausible, administration blunders or other goading conditions on campus could be expected to be attacked by those students.

The novelty and dramatic qualities of such events; the youthfulness, vivacity, audacity and expressive and other exploitable qualities of the students, and the emotion-eliciting language associated with the action commanded the attention of mass media. Phenomena with these qualities have value which can be "cashed in on" to acquire recognition and gain other advantages for those who work in mass media; and they have value for those who have something to sell. Accordingly, both careers and audiences could be built through the exploitation of activism as "news", "human interest" or whatever.

Format, commercial and other considerations (see Chapter IV above) in combination ensured that the turmoil and activism which was reported, discussed and so forth was selected and transformed for mass exposure. The subjects which had a greater chance of appearing in the mass media were (and still tend to be) looked for and found in larger metropolitan centres and either implicitly or explicitly treated as if a new "trend" had been discovered. (The expectation is not infrequently conveyed to the audience that "what's happening" today in New York or San Francisco will eventually be happening everywhere; and thereby self-fulfilling prophecies are announced). Accordingly, newsmen, commentators and writers (e.g. Stern, 1966) spoke of a "Berkeley model" and hinterland peoples, such as western Canadians were typically apprised of Berkeley's "free speech movement" before they discovered (if they ever did) that, prior to that movement's inception, students in Quebec, for example, had embarked on an activist course (which was also based on a model -- from metropolitan France) (LaTouche, 1968; see also Chapter IV above). Selection of material, then, for what is to be presented as news or other mass media fare, appears to reflect an assumption on the part of the news makers, that events in a metropolis are more significant for and/or are of comparatively greater interest to not only the residents of the metropolis but those who dwell in the hinterland as well.[5] Accordingly, to the extent that business with its mass media, as well as other institutions such as schools, successfully encourage hinterland people to focus their attention on metropolitan models, audiences are built for such models. Selection does not end there however. As Brown (1971), Hall and Whannel (1964) and others have indicated (see Casty 1968; Cirino, 1971; Rosenberg and White 1964) the economics and format of mass media combine in pursuading those who produce the fare for mass audiences that the subject must be simplified, and emphasis must be placed on the vivid or glamourous or whatever might hold promise for arresting attention. Thus, editing and the other considerations which have been mentioned are additional selective influences which are, at least in part, based on economics. Moreover, procedures for selection, simplification and emphasis are also procedures of transformation.

---

[5] Hinterland people might be influenced by metropolitan people just as children are influenced by the more powerful and visible adults in their lives, and workers are influenced by their employers. Not only are hinterland peoples generally less powerful than those of the metropolis; their organizations, institutions, economics, policies and cultures, generally reflect habits of dependency. The size, organization, deployment and equipment of armed services and police in hinterlands reflect this dependency as do the investment, production, distribution, marketing, and consumption patterns of the hinterland economies. Just as financial arrangements for Canadian business and government are frequently made in New York, so are wire service dispatches, and television news clips edited there (see Finnigan and Gonick, 1972). Just as the industrial research and development on which Canadians rely is primarily carried out in the USA, so Canadians habitually look to the same country for cues as to educational practice. Instructional materials, ideas, personnel, and techniques are imported along with definitions of what is significant, problematical, or remediable. As Cairns (1974) suggests, "intellectual capital" seems to follow finance and other material capital (see also Dexter, 1970). Accordingly, not only commerce, but mass media, educational and perhaps other institutions help hinterland peoples to focus their attention on and encourage the adoption of metropolitan models of action, problems, solutions and definitions of reality generally. In short, as the weaker imitate the more powerful, the ideas from the centres of power are adopted by those at the periphery.

The transformational procedures, then, in simplifying, emphasizing and glamourizing a subject for mass audiences, are particularly effective if images and stereotypes can be created and utilized and if ideas can be simplified, reduced to slogans, catch phrases and cliches or eliminated altogether. Accordingly, the models of activism to which mass audiences were exposed, were more readily imitated than the original material which they represented.

Thus, in a world plagued by persistent difficulties which critics and mass communications made more visible and dramatic, a stereotype of youth evolved. In the context of circumstances which engendered a sense of immanent calamity in social critics, alarming views (of the various impending disasters and the conditions, relations and events which apparently were doing injury to man) were disseminated. These criticisms directed people's attention to, and gave palpable shape to alleged sources of people's pains, discomforts and fears. Consequently, those young people who broke the torpor of the 1950s with action against what were represented to be the sources of misery could readily be interpreted as heroic visionary-victims. Those whose shouts and placards demanded that freedom and democracy be installed, and repression and unfreedoms be eliminated as they paralysed schools, represented not only dramatic figures which could be commercially exploited, but a source of hope for those American intellectuals who had appointed the young to be the agents who would change the conditions which these critics would transform.

The conditions and relations which produced and maintained proverty, hunger, disease and other pains had persisted. And these noxious conditions had become increasingly intolerable in the context of a much publicized and unprecedented prosperity in the USA.[6] As dramatic incidents involving Afro-Americans who were struggling to overcome their oppression were televised, the terms in which the difficulties were cast and a style of analysis became familiar to those who watched in the most remote hinterlands. Just as the actual and prospective achievement of formal independence by African and other colonial peoples and a variety of liberation struggles informed some Afro-American efforts, so public depiction and discussion of both encouraged others to construe events in black and white terms.

A justifiable and instrumental habit of mind in those struggles was modelled and imitated. This may have occured because it was so simple and therefore easily assimilated by masses who were repeatedly and consistently exposed to it in mass media and everyday life. Thus, the slogans, style of speech, mannerisms, dress and other characteristics of black models were affected by non-blacks as well. Commercial exploitation of these dramatic figures and events which entailed the exposure of these models to masses, provided eliciting cues as well as slogans and thought patterns whose simplicity permitted them to be generalized by observers.

---

[6] Cold war bombast and propaganda which boasted of conditions and relations which were supposedly the lot of peoples of the so-called free world but which were at variance with the reality which large numbers of those people suffered, may have constituted models of alternatives to that reality. Models of more desirable conditions and relations may have been incentives which might have been perceived to be attainable through actions (e.g. "participation", "initiative", "pursuit of happiness") to which the same rhetoric made reference.

Accordingly, when politicized students who attempted to assist the Afro-Americans returned to their campuses and turmoil ensued, the slogans, terms of analysis and tactics which became manifest, closely resembled those of their black models. The mass media exploitation of these students in turn, provided models for mass media users everywhere. As a consequence, students who were remote from all these events imitated the verbal and other behaviors of these metropolitan Americans, rather than, for example, colonial syndicalist activists.

These influences, together with the already established commercially contrived cult of youth focused attention on schools. American blacks had concentrated on school desegregation and, as can be inferred from Barzun's (1954) and Hofstadter's (1963) works, this concentration reflected a well established American tradition. Americans had been encouraged for decades to expect their schools to solve their problems. And these extravagant expectations had in turn been addressed by a long line of critics who generally shared not only the extravagant expectations, but a set of romantic assumptions and ideas whose expression conformed closely to, not only the slogans of the black disrupters, but the traditional ideology of liberalism.

Thus, when some young people marched and called for liberty, freedom of speech, democracy, participation, equal opportunity, and an end to discrimination and inequality in the context of widespread racial strife, social critics and others who shared libertarian views, treated the young people sympathetically. The critics supported the claims of the young protesters that the schools were victimizing not only the blacks, but young people as well. The schools had failed to produce the harmony which was expected. Accordingly, when some young people made common cause with their fellow victims, they were treated sympathetically by those who believed that the young were corrupted and mutiliated by adults in general and school people in particular. Such people apparently assumed that if more freedom, equality, self-determination, and less discrimination would relieve the suffering of blacks and consequently build a better America, then the young in general would, with greater doses of the same democractic medicine, cure the USA of its pains.

Liberal myths which pervaded the ideology of the American leftists were, after all, created by and served the interests of the enterpreneurial class. Accordingly, behaviors which reflected prejudices against organization, planning, bureaucracy and leadership; and campaigns which sought freedom, equality, individuality, creativity, and democracy through schooling changes, were as American as apple pie and violence.

But if the distribution of wealth and power remained intact and the means and relations of production structured people's lives outside of school, the society and culture as a going concern would inform the behavior of people within the school. Indeed, that control might be even more effective if the young people in schools were granted the conditions and arrangements within schools which allowed them to delude themselves with the fantasy that nobody but themselves influenced the form and content of their "individual", "spontaneous", "creative" or "participatory" actions (Skinner 1971, pp.36-39, 40). If the mass marketing apparatus informs people's tastes, preferences and interests, the established business order could only profit from a granting of individual "choice" and "freedom" to students in shaping their own activities. Besides, the minimization of attempts to develop competing and less profitable interests and the elimination of ideas which are subversive to the business order might be effected by transforming the school into a free but costly and profitable smorgasbord and the teachers into "resource persons" who are kept busy filling orders and ensuring that everyone is happy as they sample the mass produced but "individualized" "packages" of half-baked "values" designed for "creative", "ecstatic" consumption. In effect, capitalism could deliver the same "goods", and deliver them more quickly than the activists, who in their ignorance of history and naive enthusiasm for and faith in the creative capacity of everyman, thought they had invented the first class level. Accordingly, television and other mass media audiences were treated to a simple image of apparently victimized youth acting on behalf of the familiar sacred values: freedom, democracy and so forth.

The simple image could elicit and the rhetoric could be used to rationalize virtually any activism. Accordingly, in the name of liberation, rights, participation, and revolution, actions based on petty and vaguely-felt, non-political complaints became commonplace. In the melee, school officials often made frantic and ill-considered "reforms" which "reform-entrepreneurs" urged upon them and which are still with us.

Those political radicals like Price and Bordo, who were not seduced by the American myths which exaggerated the importance of youth, schools, nose counts, participation, creativity, individuality and "counter culture" as transformational influences, took their activities off campus and into the surrounding milieu which give schools their character. But in taking themselves off campus to develop a radical base and constituency, they removed active critics of and alternatives to the myths on which the so-called student movement choked (Gitlin, 1972). In the absence of active representatives of a vigorous socialist tradition, activists on campus would be less likely to disabuse themselves of fantasies about, for example, a revolution that supposedly could be based on the large medium webs of a deeply conservative Catholic who was designing an electronic liturgy for the Vatican to school all of the people some of the time (McLuhan; see Miller, 1971), or the small medium webs of a liberally convivial Catholic who had resigned from the Vatican's service to prevent some of the people from being schooled all of the time (Illich, see Gintis, 1973).

Those political activists who favored "spontaneity" and primary democracy consigned themselves to crowded anonymity, political ineffectuality or silent and vulnerable isolation when the majorities' limited, mundane, and essentially apolitical demands were met and their energies dissipated in the directionless busyness of participation. Once schools extended their tolerance for harmless deviance; once they had accommodated the amusing notion that "everyone is an artist" (Buckman, 1970, pp.248,249); and once "educators" had rationalized the sacrifice of standards of work, literacy, and disciplined knowledge with fantasies about the good that would be done by a universalized individuality and creativity which would allegedly blossom when everyone was given the freedom to do "their own thing" (ibid.), turmoil was replaced by the saddening spectacle of confident ignorance indulging itself in adiaphorous playpens.[7]

---

[7] Perhaps it was because so many of the young people who became activists "were lazy" and "poorly read" (Buckman, 1970, p.130) that many disrupters apparently believed that "submission to a discipline is inherently 'alienating'" (Lasch, 1971, p.46); that love, brotherhood, and all that is good, would emerge if people were free to participate in all the decisions that affect them; and that the "principle of competence, according to which authority should be excercised by those who are best qualified to exercise it and who understand the consequences of their decisions" (ibid.) could and should be replaced in schools by the dictates of the conscience of the majority. Thus, they were probably unaware of the considerations which moved Freud (1933; see p.61 [1965] edition) to observe that "as regards conscience God has done an uneven and careless piece of work, for a large majority of men have brought along with them only a modest amount of it or scarcely enough to be worth mentioning". Nor do they seem to have weighed the possibility that the "mystique of participation" and the notion that "Education and 'life', art and 'reality', understanding and action are radically opposed" (which were emphasized in the so-called counter-culture), were also reflections of "prevailing values" that were "assiduously" encouraged in "official propaganda" (Lasch, 1971, p.46). Accordingly, many American students (as well as those who imitated them) pursued a counterfeit "revolution" while clinging to "the illusion that competence is equally distributed among people of good intentions" and regarding "any attempt to uphold professional standards as a betrayal of democracy" (ibid.). Even though "two hundred years of history have been hard on the proposition that individual freedom gathers itself automatically into collective welfare" and "nothing in our experience indicates that just by making universities freer and more loving places" the conditions and relations which are perilous for the species will be transformed, (Ohmann, 1971, p.55) large numbers of students actively pursued the "democratization" of classrooms. Encouraged by those like Holt (op.cit.) who would abolish distinctions (such as that between those who teach and those who are taught) -- distinctions which even Dewey (see Hofstadter, 1963, pp.374,376) ~~and~~ Goodman (1964) would maintain -- these young people may have jeopardized whatever "understanding", "art", and "education" schools might encourage when they insisted on the predominance of their own "democratic" versions of "life", "reality", and "participation". Little heed was paid to those like Lasch (op.cit., p.47) who argued that this democratization of classrooms would "quickly complete the wreckage of an already debased higher education". Burgess (The New York Times Magazine November 19, 1972, p.30) characterized the consequences which follow from action based on the questionable arguement that if everyone has a right to a vote and a minimum income, then everyone has a right to a university education and to shape its content. Said Burgess:

> If everybody has this right, it seems reasonable to fit the crown of scholarship to the head that seeks to wear it: The crown must not be too heavy (gold is heavy); the crown must come in the right number of sizes and it must not cost too much. In other words, it must not be a crown at all, since a crown implies the hierarchic, the elitist (ibid.)

Changes which for many people have the appearance of the progressive diverted attention to pursuits other than activism, and may have contributed to the reduction of that turmoil which was created by those whose complaints were seen through apolitical and/or liberal lenses. Perhaps many were tamed by the changes in admission and performance standards in educational institutions together with the emplacement of smorgasbord curricula; the expenditures on gadgets and hardware which permitted play and experience with "multimedia" and reduced the importance of books and print; the adoption and use of technical, space-age jargon which transformed work periods into "modules" and language into "communication"; and the new emphasis on sensitivity, encounters, individuality and creativity which emphasized the "here andnow" and transformed life in school into a series of happenings (e.g. see Berger, 1969). Changes in the appearance of non-school matters may have had their influence as well. Among these one might include: the lowering of the age at which one can vote and drink liquor; the relaxation of "blue laws" and mores which placed constraints on language usage and the public display of explicit sex; the provision of funds for youth projects; the creation of government departments of youth, environment and consumer affairs; the proliferation of ombudsmen, electronic media "hot lines", popular therapies and religious cults through which feelings could be expressed; the increased visibility of older and darker people in commercials and other television fare; the disappearance of sustained war from, and the appearance of peace on, television screens and front pages (even though the war was continued); and the appearance of racial harmony which was consequent to the public punishment and publicized assassination of black leaders (e.g. Newton, Seale, Brown, and Davis in the former case and

Malcolm X, King, Hampton and Jackson in the latter).

The retirement of the apolitical and perhaps most liberal activists to more pacific pursuits in the face of these developments, left the more radical activists isolated and vulnerable to repressive measures. And this vulnerability was made vivid in direct and vicarious experience. For, as Bandura and Walters (1963, p.182) explain, the powerful advertise their possession of power through that "frequently employed social influence procedure" which informs the populace of the intentions and desires of the powerful : the "administration of well-publicized rewards and penalties". Through this procedure they can "modify the behavior of many by rewarding and penalizing the behavior of [a few] individuals who are already socially visible or who become so as a result of the publicity" (ibid.). Accordingly, the public punishment and killing of students may have been significant in the inhibition of activism and the reinstatement of peace in schools. As we have seen, some, like Bernadine Dohrn, left the campus for an underground existence. Others, like Sharon Yandle, who moved off campus to do community organizing and John Gallagher who, in doing the same, took up radical journalism, changed the theatre and form of the actions they take against the obdurate reality which offends them.

But that reality and the leftists' representations or models of it persist. Wealth is still very unevenly distributed (Barnes, 1972). A few control and waste more than they need while the many need more than they get. While the dependent children of the wealthy few learn to use the power of their inheritance, the powerless progeny of wealth's servants learn to serve and recreate that inheritance and their own lot of dependency. Since the wealth and power of the few order law and labour, the distribution of power, the relations of production, the competition between unequals, the variability of condition and all the problems associated therewith, are maintained and reproduced. With the power to dispense and withhold reinforcers and punishers, the few control the many and accordingly, the major features of a political economy which was established centuries ago are reproduced and maintained. The relations, conditions and problems inherent in capitalism persist in spite of changes in details (Williams, 1968). And representations of the distribution of power and the conditions, relations and events which it produces in reproducing itself, continue to exist as models in the recorded ideas of its critics.

If possession of wealth and power affects human behavior we can expect the children of powerful parents to have models and socialization experiences which are generally different from those of children whose parents are not so privileged. If there is a tendency for those with economic advantage to be more highly educated (Gintis, 1973; Jencks, 1972; Kahl, 1953) and generally more informed, articulate, expressive and active with respect to political matters (Chaffee, McLeod and Wackman, 1973;[8] Eitzen, 1972-73; Erbe, 1964; Flacks, 1967, 1970, 1971b; Horn and Knott, 1971; Lewis and Kraut, 1972; Thomas, 1971) one would expect their offspring, following social learning principles, to manifest these characteristics more frequently than children from a normal population sample. Moreover, since the social existence of the great mass of people depends upon income from wage labour and since such people tend to be more poorly educated, and politically ignorant, inarticulate and inactive, there would be, again following social learning principles, a tendency for their children to acquire and exhibit similar qualities. In summary, to the extent that the uneven distribution of wealth and power persists, one can expect that those who inherit power will continue to be more active in political affairs than those who in childhood are dependent on parents who at the same time depend on the sale of their labour power to the more powerful.

---

[8] S. Chaffe, J. McLeod, and D. Wackman, Family communication patterns and adolescent political participation. In J. Dennis (ed.) Socialization to Politics: A Reader New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973, pp.349-364.

Accordingly, the sons and daughters of the privileged minority may have developed and may be expected to continue the development of expressive and assertive, or generally aggressive instrumental behaviors, as a consequence of the condition of their class. The possession of power enables one to produce effects. People who possess such power might be expected to acquire the habit of using it. Thus, the present writer sees plausibility in the proposition that there is a high probability that among those students who were and are the first to actively confront tasks and problems, (as opposed to responding passively or avoiding or withdrawing from them) the offspring of the privileged were and will continue to be overrepresented. Moreover, they were and are likely to be overrepresented among those who discuss, read about and otherwise involve themselves in political affairs. Accordingly, there is also a higher probability that such students will encounter critical representations (ideas or models) of reality and models of alternatives to that reality. Thus in the future, if they observe models (e.g. Castro and Guevara; see Guevara, 1970) whose actions are instrumental, those models may serve as cues which elicit their intrusive habits.

If their actions are, in turn, exploited as were those of the political activists discussed herein, for the purposes discussed above (in Chapter V) this mediation will present simplified but vivid models to more common adolescents whose inhibitions to action can be reduced and novel actions learned through observation. The popularization of activism then, as now, might be thought of as mass-mediated, "cue-elicited aggression" (Geen, 1968; Geen and O'Neal, 1969).

If liberal societies continue to be plagued by noxious arrangements, conditions and events, and if at the same time the commercial culture of those societies continues to treat youth as a value with which all other values can be associated for the sake of private or collective ambition, we can expect to see the reappearance of youthful activists. And we can expect to see their activism create turmoil in schools if these societies continue to burden their schools with misplaced ambitions and expectations which are so extravagant that school "failure" is inevitable. However, even if these conditions persist, the reappearance of turmoil in schools may depend on the recurrence of a period of sustained prosperity. Concern with concrete necessities might be expected to replace the luxury of exploratory vacations in the realm of abstraction and possibility, when "recession" or depression exists. If bread and shelter can no longer be taken for granted they may become more important than freedom, youth and the like.

When business prospers, businessmen behave expansively and optimistically. New possibilities are entertained, explored and exploited. The activities which take place within economies which are dominated by private capital are conditioned by such behavior. The post-World War II period of prosperity has been, generally (until the end of the 1960's) a period in which the controllers of capital behaved in an expansive and optimistic manner. As a consequence, one might characterize the prevailing attitude, the Zeitgeist of the time as expansive and optimistic. The development and emplacement of a large array of expensive infrasturctural facilities such as highways, airports, television networks and schools both reflected and contributed to that expansive and optimistic outlook. Unprecedented travel, spectacular space probes, and formerly incredible gadgets like computers and television encouraged the comfortable to conclude that virtually anything was possible. Few suspected the sobreity or intelligence of those who spoke, in serious circles, of the arrival of a "post-scarcity" or a "post-industrial" or a "pre-figurative" world and other such epiphenomenal dreams that attend euphoric optimism (e.g. see Mann, 1974; Mead, 1970). This expansive and optimistic behavior may also be betrayed by the replacement of old stereotypes of youth in mass media. In the mid-sixties Adelson (1964) observed that mass media evaluations of adolescents as manifested in their stereotypes had undergone change. The earlier mass media portrayals indicated that the adolescent was evaluated as a figure "of little substance" who was stereotyped as a "fool", a "figure of fun: callow, flighty, silly, given to infatuations, wild enthusiasms and transient moodiness". As a "... sensitive, emotionally afflicted, overly sentimental" figure, the adolescent was nevertheless "loveable, though sometimes exasperating and not to be taken too seriously". After all, "he would get over it -- whatever it might be -- in time" (ibid., p.1). The stereotype which Adelson (ibid) documented as the replacement for the "adolescent as fool" image, attributed much more value to youth. Indeed, the characteristics of the stereotype which Adelson (ibid) called "adolescent as Visionary-Victim" suggest that youth may have become "overvalued"

(Gitlin, 1972; also see Chapter V above).

In a culture where "youth was overvalued", in a society where people have been encouraged to have "faith in youth" (Gitlin, 1972) the youthful activists' slogans and cliches that contained words which were familiar, highly moralistic and had sentimental appeal, were substituted for ideas in mass media treatments of activism (ibid). Accordingly, observers who were apolitical, or even anti-political, but who were annoyed by conditions or events which, in their optimism they expected schools to remediate, indiscriminately praised and applauded "todays youth" for their alleged (and widely publicized) "rejection of phoniness and superficiality",[9] their "gutsiness",[10] their greater intelligence and better education[11] and their accurate sense of what is important and right.[12] Similarly, youthful observers who were apolitical or even anti-political, perhaps encouraged by the hot-line hysteria and clack of those adults who incessantly carped about teachers[13] who allegedly prevented schools from making right whatever might be wrong, apparently matched the behavioral cues provided by the young political activists. After all, when inclusive categories were used, political activists were, in effect, represented to be like themselves. If youth per se was praised for being morally superior, wise and so forth, the term included the nonpolitical youth. And as Bandura and Walters (1963) have shown, observers will tend to imitate even deviant behaviors if the models are successful in procurring reinforcers and/or if the models are represented as persons who resemble or are similar to the observers. Thus, elevated by accolades, furnished with ready made complaints, and cued by example, the ordinary young man could act to remove mundane discomforts while shouting that he was acting on behalf of youth, freedom, equality, individuality, creativity, and all the good things schools were expected to nurture and develop. Since the schools were failing to do what was expected of them and even worse, they were allegedly enslaving, destroying and mutilating young people at the same time, one need

---

[9] H. Resnick, The apotheosis of masscult. Saturday Review. November 21, 1970, p.45.

[10] Time, August 17, 1970, p.35.

[11] ibid, p.36.

[12] C. Wyzanski, A federal judge digs the young. Saturday Review, July 20, 1968, p.15.

---

[13] Educators in North America have generally been relatively ineffective in procuring praise, respect and other social reinforcers. Their lot as dependent wage workers has not attracted many persons from the privileged ranks. These considerations, together with the people's cultivated and traditional habits of expecting more of the schools than teachers can produce make teachers look ineffective, both in their own eyes and those of others. Not surprisingly, then, many educators are noticeably introverted and compliant as they are exhorted by more powerful groups such as businessmen, to fix everything (Goodman, 1960, 1964). Teacher acceptance of the grand ambitions, which groups who are noticeably more prestigious and successful, bestow on teachers, may be a consequence of anticipated reinforcement for imitation of those groups and acceptance of their models of reality. Accordingly, many teachers may have been, by virtue of their ineffectuality, dependency, introversion, imitative set and the attention to and arousal elicited by young people, particularly predisposed to observe and assimilate the models of reality and alternatives to it, which originated with adult critics but which mass media associated with highly visible, attractive, expressive, assertive and "over valued" youth. If the young possess a reputation for taking wise, virtuous and progressive stances many educators who perceive themselves in those terms, or desire those qualities or at least that sort of reputation, might be particularly inclined to espouse the ideas attributed to the young. The data in the Blair and Pendleton (1971) study suggest that this might have occurred.

The present writer is inclined to propose that more attention be paid to model influences in selecting candidates for teacher training and in the training itself. We might be more sensible in our selection and training if we make discriminations, for example, between those who read only The Readers' Digest or Time or nothing at all, and those who have reading habits which are more suitable to school workers.

not be bashful about "liberating" them. For even some of the teachers might help. And judging from adjustments made in schools, somebody accomodated them.

When turmoil subsided after the schools had made adjustments; after the political activists had left school, became inhibited, and/or buried themselves in other circumstances; and after the mass media lost interest in what had become normal, the uneven distribution of wealth and power remained. And so did the uneven distribution of deprivation and dependency remain. Indeed, virtually all of the conditions, relations and events which leftists criticized are still with us even though they seem to appear and disappear alternately as the mass media and popular critics follow one another from one "issue" to the "next". These conditions do not betray any sign that they will soon disappear. Nor is it likely that children will become less dependent on those adults who raise them or workers less dependent on their employers. Even the tradition of asking schools to do the impossible is unlikely to disappear soon, since in the USA, at least, "the school is [their] answer to Karl Marx -- and to anything else" even though "the school system has failed".[14] All that may be missing from the conditions which are sufficient for the production of turmoil are prosperity, a carrier movement[15] such as was provided by the colonial and Afro-American peoples, and a visible and successful model.

---

[14] P. Schrag End of the impossible dream, Saturday Review September 19, 1970, p.68.

[15] Blumer (1951; also in McLaughlin, 1969, pp.8-29) uses the term "general social movement". These movements "develop, sensitivities, arouse hopes, and break down resistances" as well as arouse "dissatisfactions", implant "suggestions" and provide "examples". They provide "the setting out of which develop specific social movements" (pp.10-11) and "leaders" who are "pace-makers" (p.10). "Expressive movements" like "fashion movements" (pp.23, 25-27) can be produced as well.

Some Propositions: Toward a Theory of Activism

The foregoing analysis suggests a number of propositions which are regarded by the present writer as modest, provisional statements about a number of plausible though rudimentary relationships. They are presented here, following the example of Zald and Ash (1966; see also McLaughlin, 1969, pp.461-485), as an "attempt to specify some of the major factors" influencing political activism and turmoil in education institutions" and to provide illustrative propositions" as befit "an essay in theoretical synthesis" (ibid., p.463).

In contemporary liberal society:

The uneven distribution of wealth is related to the uneven distribution of power.

The uneven distribution of power is related to an uneven distribution of dependency and deprivation.

The uneven distribution of dependency is related to an uneven distribution of ability to control reinforcers and punishers.[16]

There is an inverse relationship between the frequency of emission of one's dependency behaviors and the probability that one's behavior will be instrumental in controlling the reinforcers and punishers of others (excepting one's own dependents) and a positive relationship between the emission of dependent behaviors and the acquisition of control of one's own reinforcers and punishers.

---

[16] In the present and following discussion, references to "control of reinforcers and punishers" should be understood to mean that one who possesses such control is one who has the power to acquire and/or create, dispense, withhold and control others' access to reinforcers; and such a person also possesses the power to create, dispense, withhold and/or control the extent to which others must endure punishment.

The more a person controls his own and others' reinforcers and punishers, the greater is the probability that the others will imitate the behavior of the person who controls the reinforcers and punishers; and the more those whose reinforcers and punishers are under the control of the other, imitate that other, the greater is the probability that their behavior will have instrumental effects for themselves and the greater is the probability that their dependency behavior will persist.

The less one's reinforcers and punishers are under the control of others the higher is the probability that one will emit deviant (i.e. atypical, abnormal, unusual, "original", novel) social behavior; and the lower is the probability that the novel behavior will be followed by punishment or be defined and treated as reprehensible or undesirable conduct.

The more one controls reinforcers and punishers, the higher is the probability that honorific signs and symbols will be associated with that person's behavior. That is, such behavior and the person himself will be associated with such terms as successful, effective, progressive, inventive, sensible, practical, innovative, and so forth.

The more one controls reinforcers and punishers the higher is the probability that one's conduct will arrest the attention of persons who have less control of reinforcers and punishers.

The greater a person's control of reinforcers and punishers, the greater is the probability that the person and his behavior (or facsimilies of them) will be represented as exemplary models.

The more frequently one is represented as an exemplary model the more frequently one will be represented in association with primary, social and generalized reinforcers and their signs in mass media.

The more frequently exemplary models are associated with values in mass media representations, the higher is the probability that the representations of the original models will deviate from their original referents as transformational processes are used to simplify, exaggerate or augment those model attributes which research on associational preferences and other (e.g. purchasing power) audience characteristics indicates are more likely to serve the producers purposes.

The more novel and the more aggressive (expressive, assertive, coercive) and the more "successful" is a person's behavior, the higher is the probability that the behavior will be represented in mass media. And the extent to which one controls, or is reputed to control, reinforcers and punishers, affects the manner in which the behavior is represented (e.g. the associations which are made in the representation). That is, there is a positive relationship between the extent to which one's novel, aggressive or "successful" behavior is represented as and is associated with the positively valued (desired) and one's association with power and success. Accordingly, the novel behaviors (or even the not so novel behavior which is represented as novel) of the wealthy, or that of their progeny, or that of their most prestigious and most highly rewarded servants or the latter's offspring, have a higher probability of being represented and associated with positively loaded signs, symbols and images in mass media than does the deviant behavior of the less powerful. While models tend to be selected from those who deviate from the modal, there is a higher probability that the deviant behavior of the dependent or powerless will be represented in association with words, images and consequences which elicit negative affective responses from those who observe the representations.

However, if members of advantaged or more powerful minorities behave in a deviant manner and the behavior is represented in mass media in approving, admiring, honorific but categorical terms which allow less powerful observers to perceive the models to be similar to themselves, there will be a tendency for the less powerful observers to emit matching behavior and a tendency for mass media to represent that imitative behavior as identical to the original deviant behavior.

To the extent that there is variability in the extent to which people have control over production, social relations, and material conditions generally, there will be variability in the parental behaviors and the other models which children observe. Accordingly, there is a higher probability that the children of those who exercise power in the economy and society will learn expressive, assertive, coercive, political behavior than the children of wage workers who do not act as owner proxies or privileged servants. The frequency with which such behavior is observed affects the probability of acquiring skills and predispositions which in turn affect the probability of encountering, attending to, representing, remembering, and being reinforced for reproducing the behavior of live or symbolic models which are critical of reality and are either active in altering it or instructive and encouraging for those who would do so. The greater the frequency of passive, dependency behaviors a child observes his parental models emit, the higher is the probability that he will learn dependency behavior and the lower is the probability that he will learn high magnitude, expressive, aggressive, active political behavior.

Those young people who have learned to act in an assertive manner to reduce noxious stimulation and accrue pleasing consequences, will behave in an expressive, assertive, coercive, (i.e. aggressive) manner if critical representations (e.g. symbolic models, i.e. printed ideas) focus their attention on conditions, relations, objects, or events which are negatively evaluated. Accordingly, since the variability of condition which attends uneven distributions of power and wealth produces corresponding differences in parental behavior and there is a negative relationship between the possession of wealth or power and the frequency of emission of dependency behaviors, there is a higher probability that the children of less dependent, more powerful parents will be over-represented among (1) those who do not withdraw from school, (2) those who are academically successful, (3) those who read publications which treat politics, economics, sociology, and social criticism. Accordingly, there is a higher probability that among political activists, the sons and daughters of the privileged will be over-represented.

The higher the proportion of teachers who come from high dependency, low power homes, the greater will be the extent to which dependency behaviors are emphasized, the greater will be the emphasis on non-academic objectives (such as social change without disorder, or equality of opportunity) and the greater will be the influence of popular criticism, business values and other mass culture phenomena (as opposed to scholarly criticism, intellectual values and standards of high culture) in schools.

The greater the influence of popular culture in schools, and the more frequently teachers require or emphasize dependency behaviors vis a vis adolescents (e.g. deference to, obedience of, compliance with, or passive accommodation to authority) the greater is the probability that students from privileged homes will rebel.

The more frequently that students from privileged homes emit rebellious behavior, the higher is the probability that students from non-privileged homes will imitate the rebellious behavior.

The greater the number of ambitions invested in schools and the more ambiguous and numerous are the schools objectives, the higher is the probability that schools will be objects of hostility and criticism, and the more frequently teachers will be perceived as ineffective and unworthy of parental support and pupil compliance, deference and cooperation; and the higher is the probability that the schools will be perceived as a cause of people's difficulties and unfulfilled expectations; and the more schools will be beseiged with complaints.

The longer a period of prosperity is sustained the more frequently will people exhort teachers to emphasize creativity, individuality and happiness, joy, ecstacy or other qualities which are related to an emphasis of the schools' custodial function; and the less frequently will people exhort teachers to emphasize hard work, disciplined knowledge, and basic competencies or literacy.

To the extent that teachers are perceived as ineffectual and are the butt of criticism rather than the recipients of social and other reinforcers, teachers will tend to adopt and espouse their critics definitions of reality and accommodate themselves to those definitions of the desirable provided by groups who have high visibility, are expressive and are associated with "success" and the control of the reinforcers which the teachers have been ineffective in procuring.

Epilogue

This presentation of these propositions is regarded by the present writer as a very modest and tentative step toward the task of building a theory which incorporates elements from political economy and culture along with psychological principles in a synthesis which might obviate some of the disadvantages of the ahistorical perspective that inheres in what Bowers (1973) calls social psychology's "situationism". Such a new synthesis might also constitute a more substantial psychological contribution than the currently fashionable but untestable psychodynamic principles and constructs and the questionnaire research on attitudes which one commonly finds in current studies of political development and behavior. On a somewhat less recondite plane, the writer presents this work to educators as an attempt to demonstrate that we teachers can ill afford to maintain the present levels of historical ignorance, political and economic naivete, and cultural insensitivity which are betrayed in so many educators' uncritical receptivity to whatever is flogged as new, progressive, innovative, worthwhile and curative. There are too many costs entailed in accomodating all visitors. If learning and teaching in schools are to be extricated from the grips of fashionable silliness, and pop culture destructiveness and superficiality, those who teach will have to become more discriminating and modest. Perhaps if educators discontinue the tradition of being promiscuously nice and receptive to whoever proposes that the schools have an affair with his particular ambitions, they would not be so prone to accusations of failure and mischief-making. If teachers refused to attempt anything other than the creation of interests, the reduction of ignorance, the honing and the refinement of taste, people would thereby be taught that the school is not an all-purpose tool. As a consequence such people might know enough to look elsewhere and find more appropriate instruments to apply to their problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abcarain, G. Romantics and renegades: political defection and the radical left. *Journal of Social Issues,* 1971, 27, 1, 123-139.

Aberle, K.G. The Struggle at Simon Fraser University. *Monthly Review* 22, 1, May 1970, 1-16.

Adams, P. (ed.) *Language and Thinking*. Middlesex: Penguin, 1972.

Adelson, J. The mystique of adolescence. *Psychiatry*, 1964, 27, 1-5.

Adorno, T.W. Stereotyping on television. In A. Casty (ed) *Mass Media and Mass Man* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968, 64-68.

Aldridge, J.W. In the country of the young. *Harper's*, October and November, 1969.

Anastasi, A. The cultivation of diversity. *American Psychologist*, December, 1972, 1091-1099.

Anderson, C.C. Psychological contributions to education: the origin and modification of values. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research* XI, 4 (December, 1965) 203-214.

Arendt, H. Society and culture. In B. Rosenberg and D. White (eds) *Mass Culture Revisited* Toronto: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971.

Ayer, A.J. *Russell*. London: Fontana/Collins, 1972.

Baldwin, A.L. *Theories of Child Development*. New York: John Wiley, 1968, pp.5-33.

Bandura, A. *Social Learning Theory*. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1971.

Bandura, A. *Principles of Behavior Modification*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Bandura, A. The stormy decade: fact or fiction? *Psychology in the Schools*, 1964, 1, 224-231. (also in R. Grinder (ed) *Studies in Adolescence* (Second Edition) Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1969.

Bandura, A. and Jeffery, R. Role of symbolic coding and rehearsal processes in observational learning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 26, 1 (April) 1973, 131-136.

Bandura, A., Ross, D. and Ross S. Imitation and film mediated aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1963a, 66, 3-11.

Bandura, A., Ross, D. and Ross, S. Vicarious reinforcement and imitation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963b, 67, 601-607.

Bandura, A. and Walters, R.H. Social Learning and Personality Development Toronto: Holt, Rinehart, 1963.

Barnes, P. How wealth is distributed: The G.N.P. machine. The New Republic. September 30, 1972.

Barr, D. Who Pushed Humpty-Dumpty: Dilemmas in American Education Today. New York: Atheneum, 1971.

Barzun, J. The danger of 'public service'. In I. Wallerstein and P. Starr (eds) The University Crisis Reader Vol. I, 1971.

Barzun, J. The House of Intellect. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961.

Barzun, J. Darwin, Marx, Wagner (Second Edition) Garden City: Anchor, 1958.

Barzun, J. Teacher in America. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1954.

Bay, Christian. Political and apolitical students: facts in search of theory. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 3, 76-91.

Bayer, A.E. and Austin, A.W. Cited in: Campus tensions: analyses and recommendations, Report of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions. American Psychologist, 1970, 25, 8, 694-726.

Bell, D. Mass Society. In M. Curtis (ed) The Nature of Politics. New York: Avon, 1962.

Becker, Carl. Economics. In M. Curtis (ed) The Nature of Politics. New York: Hearst (Avon Book Div.), 1962, 75-79.

Bereiter, C. Moral alternatives to education. Interchange 3, 1, 1972, 25-41.

Berger, B.M. The new stage of American man - almost endless adolescence. The New York Times Magazine, November 2, 1969.

Berger, P.L. and Luckman, T. The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge. Garden City: Anchor, 1967.

Berkowitz, L. (ed). Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1964, 1.

Berkowitz, L. Social Psychology. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1972.

Berkowitz, L, Frustrations, comparisons and other sources of emotional arousal as Contributors to social unrest. Journal of Social Issues, 1972b, 28, 1.

Berrion, F.K., Arkoff, A. and Shinkuro, I. Generational differences in values...Journal of Social Psychology, 1967, 71, 169-175.

Bettleheim, B. The roots of radicalism. Playboy, March, 1971.

Blackburn, R. A brief guide to bourgeois ideology. In A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn (eds) Student Power, Middlesex: Penguin, 1969, 162-213.

Blackburn, R. The unequal society. In R. Blackburn and A. Cockburn (eds) The Incompatibles: Trade Union Militancy and the Consensus. Middlesex: Penguin, 1967, 15-55.

Blackburn, R. and Cockburn, A. (eds) The Incompatibles: Trade Union Militancy and the Consensus. Middlesex: Penguin, 1967.

Blair, G.M. and Pendleton, C. Attitudes of youth toward current issues as perceived by teachers and adolescents. Adolescence VI, 24, Winter 1971, 424-428.

Blumer, H. Social movements. In B. McLaughlin (ed) Studies in Social Movements. Toronto, 1969, 8-29.

Boffey, P. Campus unrest: Riots bring danger of backlash. Science Vol. 164, April 11, 1969, 161-165.

Boorstin, D. The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America. New York: Harper, 1964.

Bottomore, T.B. Social Criticism in North America. Toronto: CBC 1966.

Bottomore, T.B. Elites and Society. Middlesex: Penguin 1966.

Bottomore, T.B. and Rubel, M. (eds) Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy. Middlesex: Penguin, 1963.

Bowers, K. Situationism in psychology: an analysis and a critique Psychological Review, 80, 5, (September) 1973, 307-336.

Braddock, J. Strife on Campus, In T. Reid and J. Reid (eds) Student Power and the Canadian Campus. Toronto: Peter Martin, 1969, 115-125.

Brewer, R. and Brewer, M. Expressed evaluation toward a social object as a function of label. Journal of Social Psychology 84, (August,1971) 257-260.

Briemberg, M. A taste of better things: PSA at SFU. This Magazine is About Schools, Winter 1970, 4, 1, 30-55.

Brogan, H. All over there. The Manchester Guardian, May 11, 1974, p.22.

Broudy, H.S. What will become of them? The Humanist XXXI, 3 (May/June) 1971.

Brown, D.R. Student stress and institutional environment. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 3, 92-107.

Brown, L. Television: The Business Behind the Box. New York: Harcourt Brace (Harvest) 1971.

Brustein, R. The case for professionalism. The New Republic, April 26, 1969.

Brzezinski, Z. Revolution and counter revolution (but not necessarily about Columbia). The New Republic, June, 1968, 23, 23-25.

Buckman, P. The Limits of Protest: A Radical View of Why it's Needed and How it Fails. London: Panther, 1970.

Cairns, A. National influences on the study of politics. Queen's Quarterly 81, 3 (Autumn) 1974, 333-347.

Califano, J. (Jr.) The Student Revolution: A Global Confrontation. Toronto: George J. McLeod, 1970.

Cambell, C. A comment on whether teaching implies learning. Harvard Educational Review XXXV (Winter 1965) 82-83.

Cannel, W. and Macklin, J. The Human Nature Industry: How Human Nature is Manufactured, Distributed, Advertised and Consumed. New York: Anchor, 1974.

Caplan, G.L. and Laxer, J. Perspectives on un-American traditions in Canada. In I Lumsden (ed) Close the 49th Parallel, etc.: The Americanization of Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Casty, A. (ed) Mass Media and Mass Man. New York: Holt Rinehart 1968.

Caute, D. Fanon. London: Fontana/Collins, 1970.

Cauthen, N.R. et.al. Stereotypes: A review of the literature 1926-1968. Journal of Social Psychology, 1971, 84, 103-125.

Christoffel, T., Finkelhor, D. and Gilbarg, D. Up Against the American Myth. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Cirino, R. Don't Blame the People: How the News Media...Manipulate Public Opinion. Los Angeles: Diversity Press, 1971.

Cockburn, A. Introduction. In A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn (eds) Student Power: Problems, Diagnosis, Action. Middlesex: Penguin, 1969, 7-21.

Cockburn, A. and Blackburn, R. (eds) Student Power. Middlesex: Penguin, 1969.

Cohn-Bendit, D. et.al. Why sociologists? In A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn (eds) Student Power: Problems, Diagnosis, Action. Middlesex: Penguin, 1969, 373-378.

Conger, J. Adolescence and Youth: Psychological Development in a Changing World. New York: Harper Row, 1973.

Conquest, R. Lenin. London: Fontana/Collins, 1972.

Cornelius, D. and St. Vincent, E. (eds) Cultures in Conflict: Perspectives on the Snow-Leavis Controversy. Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1964.

Crick, B. and Robson, W.A. (eds) Protest and Discontent. Middlesex: Penguin, 1970.

Curtis, M. (ed) The Nature of Politics. New York: Hearst (Avon Book Div.) 1962.

Davidson, C. Campaigning on campus. In A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn (eds) Student Power. Middlesex: Penguin, 1969.

Davidson, C. Student power: a radical view. In I Wallerstein and P. Starr (eds) The University Crisis Reader, Toronto: Vintage, 1971, 1, 484-487.

de Grazia, S. Of Time, Work and Leisure. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday/Anchor, 1964.

De Mott, B. The 'more life' school. Saturday Review, January 10, 1972, pp.25-26.

Deutscher, I. Lenin's Childhood. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Dexter, G. Yes, cultural imperalism too. In I. Lumsden (ed) Close the 49th Parallel, etc. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970, 157-169.

Divoky, D. How Old Will You Be in 1984? New York: Avon, 1969a.

Divoky, D. Revolt in the high schools: the way it's going to be. Saturday Review, February 15, 1969b.

Domhoff, G.W. Who Rules America? Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Eitzen, D.S. Status consistency and consistency of political beliefs. Public Opinion Quarterly 1972-1973 (Winter) 4, XXVI, 541-548.

Elkin, F. and Handel, G. *The Child and Society: The Process of Socialization* (Second Edition) Random House, 1972.

Elkin, F. and Westley, W. The myth of adolescent culture. *American Sociological Review,* 1955, 20, 680-684.

Elkin, F. and Westley, W. The protection environment and adolescent socialization. *Social Forces,* 1957, 35, 243-249.

Ellul, J. *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes,* Toronto: Vintage, 1973.

Epperson, D.L. A reassessment of indices of parental influence in the adolescent society. *American Sociological Review,* 1964, 29, 93-86.

Erbe, W. Social involvement and political activity. *American Sociological Review,* 29, 1964.

Fairfield, R. The deadening of the high schools. *The Humanist* XXXI, 3 (May/June) 1971.

Featherstone, J. Reconsideration: John Dewey. *The New Republic*, July 8, 1972, 27-32.

Feuer, L.S. *The Conflict of Generations*. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Feuer, L.S. Conflict of generations. *Saturday Review*, January 18, 1969.

Finney, H.C. Political libertarianism at Berkeley...*Journal of Social Issues*, 1971, 27, 1, 35-61.

Finnigan, B. and Gonick, C. (eds) *Making It: The Canadian Dream*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1972.

Flacks, R. The liberated generation: an exploration of the roots of social protest. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1967, 23, 3, 52-75.

Flacks, R. Young intelligentsia in revolt. *Transaction*. June, 1970.

Flacks, R. The roots of radicalism. *Playboy*, March, 1971a.

Flacks, R. The new left and American politics after ten years. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1971b, 27, 1, 21-34.

Flavell, J. Cognitive changes in adulthood. In L.R. Goulet and P. Baltes (eds) *Life-Span Developmental Psychology - Research and Theory*, New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Freud, S. *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis,* New York: Norton, 1965.

Friedenberg, E.Z. *The Vanishing Adolescent.* New York: Dell, 1962.

Friedenberg, E.Z. Coming of Age in America. New York: Vintage, 1965.

Friedenberg, E.Z. The Dignity of Youth and Other Atavisms. Boston: Beacon, 1966.

Friedenberg, E.Z. Laing. London: Fontana/Collins, 1973.

Fromm, E. Marx's Concept of Man. New York: Frederick Unger, 1961.

Fromm, E. Beyond the Chains of Illusion. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962.

Fromm, E. Escape from Freedom. New York: Avon/Discus, 1968.

Gartner, A., Greer, C., Riessman, F. (eds). After Deschooling What? Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside (Perennial) 1973.

Geen, R. Effects of frustration, attack and prior training in aggressiveness upon aggressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 9, 4, 1968, 316-321.

Geen, R. and O'Neal, E. Activation of cue-elicited aggression by general arousal. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 11, 3, 1969, 289-292.

Gergen, K.J. Social psychology as history. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26, 2, 1973, 309-320.

Gergen, K.J. Heads against the wall. Contemporary Psychology, Vol. 19, 3 March, 1974, 182-183.

Gibson, J. Pictures, perspectives and perception. Daedalus 13, 1960, 216-229.

Gintis, H. Political economy of education. In A. Gartner et al (eds) After Deschooling What? Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1973, 29-76.

Gitlin, T. Toward a new new left, Partisan Review XXXIX, 3, 1972, 454-461.

Glazer, N. Student politics and the university. Atlantic, July, 1969.

Godfrey, D. and Watkins, M. (eds) Gordon to Watkins to You: A Documentary: The Battle for Control of our Economy. Toronto: New Press, 1970.

Goodman, P. Growing Up Absurd. New York: Vintage, 1960.

Goodman, P. Compulsory Mis-education and the Community of Scholars. New York: Vintage, 1964.

Gorsuch, R. and Smith, R. Changes in college students' evaluations of moral behavior: 1969 versus 1939, 1949 and 1958. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 24, 3, 1972, 381-391.

Gorz, A. From Strategy for Labor. In C. Oglesby (ed). The New Left Reader. New York: Grove Press, 1969, 41-56.

Gorz, A. Strategy for Labor. Boston: Beacon, 1968.

Gough, K. World revolution and the science of man. In T. Roszak (ed) The Dissenting Academy. Toronto: Random House (Vintage), 135-158, 1968.

Gouldner, A. The Coming Crisis of Sociology. New York: Avon/ Equinox, 1971.

Goulet, L.R. and Baltes, P. (eds). Life-span Developmental Psychology: Research and Theory. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Gray, S. Politics and the dynamics of change. Canadian Alternatives, February, 1966a, 1, 1, 39-55.

Gray, S. Ideology and revolution -- part 1. Canadian Alternatives, April, 1966b, 1, 2, 33-50.

Gray, S. Ideology and revolution -- part 2. Canadian Alternatives, July, 1966c, 1, 3-4, 32-47.

Gray, S. The troubles at McGill. In T. Reid and J. Reid (eds) Student Power and the Canadian Campus. Toronto: Peter Martin, 1969, 48-56.

Gray, S. Schools, language and the national liberation struggle. This Magazine is About Schools. Spring, 1970, 4, 2, 78-100.

Greenberg, C. Avante-garde and kitsch. In B. Rosenberg and D. White (eds) Mass Culture. New York: Free Press, 1964, 98-110.

Greene, M. And it still is news. In A. Gartner et al (eds) After Deschooling What? Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1973, 129-136.

Griffith, J.A.G. Why we need a revolution. In B. Crick and W.A. Robson (eds.) Protest and Discontent. Middlesex: Penguin, 1970, 25-36.

Grinder, R. (ed) Studies in Adolescence (Second Edition) Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1969.

Grinder, R. Adolescence. New York: John Wiley, 1973.

Guevara, E. Man and socialism in Cuba. In A. Lothstein (ed) "All We Are Saying..." New York: Capricorn, 1970, pp.365-381.

Gusfield, J. (ed). Protest, Reform and Revolt: A Reader in Social Movements. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Hacker, A. The End of the American Era. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1970.

Hacker, A. Getting used to mugging. The New York Review of Books, April 19, 1973.

Hadden, J. The private generation. Psychology Today, October, 1969, 32-35, 68-69.

Hall, S. and Whannel, P. The Popular Arts. Toronto: Hutchinson, 1964.

Halliday, F. Students of theworld unite. In A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn (eds) Student Power. Middlesex: Penguin, 1969, 287-326.

Hofstadter, R. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. Toronto: Vintage 1963.

Holt, J. The fourth R -- the rate race. New York Times Magazine, May 1, 1966. (Also in G. Winter and E. Nuss (eds) The Young Adult, Glenview, 1969).

Holt, J. How Children Fail. N.Y.: Dell, 1970a.

Holt, J. The radicalizing of a guest teacher at Berkeley. New York Times Magazine, February 22, 1970b. (Also in I. Wallerstein and P. Starr (eds), The University Crisis Reader, Vol I, New York: Vintage, 1971).

Holt, J. Learning is not a stone. Los Angeles Free Press, March 19, 1971, pp. 26,28.

Hook, S. The war against the democractic process. Atlantic, February, 1969.

Horn, J.L. and Knott, P.D. Activist youth of the 60's: summary and prognosis. Science, March 12, 1971, 3975, 977-985.

Horowitz, D. The fate of Midas: A Marxist interpretation of the American social crisis. In A. Lothstein (ed.) "All we are Saying..." New York: Capricorn, 1970.

Horowitz, G. Conservatism, liberalism and socialism in Canada: An Interpretation The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science XXXII, 2, (May, 1966) 143-171.

Hoy, W. Dimensions of student alienation and characteristics of public high schools. Interchange 3, 4, 1972, 38-52.

Inkeles, A. and Levinson, D.J. National character: the study of modal personality and sociocultural systems. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds) The Handbook of Social Psychology, (second edition), Don Mills: Addison-Wesley, 1969, 4, 418-506.

Illich, I. After deschooling what? In A. Gartner et al (eds) After Deschooling What? Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1973, 1-28.

Jacobs, P. and Landau, S. The New Radicals: A Report with Documents. Toronto: Random House (Vintage), 1966.

Jahoda, M. and Warren, N. The myths of youth. Sociology of Education 1965, 38, 2. (Also in G. Winter and E. Nuss (eds.) The Young Adult, Scott Foresman, 1969).

Jencks, C. et al. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America, New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Kahl, J.A. Educational and occupational aspirations of 'common man' boys. Harvard Educational Review, Summer 1953.

Kaufman, A.S. The Radical Liberal. New York: Clarion, 1970.

Kelly, G. A Theory of Personality. New York: W.W. Norton, 1963.

Kempton, M. Blue collar blues. The New York Review of Books, February 8, 1973.

Keniston, K. The sources of student dissent. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 3, 108-137.

Keniston, K. You have to grow up in Scarsdale to know how bad things really are. New York Times Magazine, 1969, April 27.

Kifner, J. Colleges change to avert disruption. The New York Times, May 11, 1969 (also in Sheffe).

Klemesrud, J. "Having a wonderful encounter" The New York Times Magazine, Dec. 20, 1970, 8-9, 13-20.

Klohr, P. A greening of the high school. The Humanist XXXI, 3 (May/June) 1971.

Kolakowski, L. The concept of the left. In C. Oglesby (ed) The New Left Reader. New York: Grove Press, 1969, 144-158.

Kopkind, A. T.V. guide. The New York Review of Books, August 8, 1974.

Kozol, J. The open schoolroom: New words for old deceptions Ramparts, Vol. II, I, (July) 1972a, 37-41.

Kozol, J. Free schools: A time for candor. Saturday Review, March 4, 1972b, 51-56.

Kozol, J. Free schools: A time for candor. Saturday Review, March 4, 1972b, 51-56.

Kozol, J. Free schools fail because they don't teach. Psychology Today Vol. 5, 11 (April, 1972c) 30-36, 114.

Kozol, J. Moving on -- to nowhere. Saturday Review No. 50 (January, 1973) 6-14.

Lane, R. and Lerner, M. Why hard-hats hate hairs. Psychology Today November, 1970, 45-48, 104-105.

Lasch, C. The Agony of the American Left. New York: Vintage, 1969.

Lasch, C. Can the left rise again? New York Review of Books, October 21, 1971.

Lash, K. Children of turmoil. Change Vol 3, No. 2 (March/April) 1971 8-9, 78-79.

Laski, H. The Rise of European Liberalism. London: Unwin Books, 1962.

La Touche, D. The Quebec student movement: Radicalism, syndicalism, reformism, revolution, realism, or what? In G. McGuigan (ed) Student Protest. Toronto: Metheun, 1968, 113-131.

Laxer, J. The student movement and Canadian independence. Canadian Dimension, September 1969.

Laxer, J. The Americanization of the Canadian student movement. In I. Lumsden (ed) Close the 49th Parallel etc.: The Americanization of Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970, 275-286.

Lebel, R. Showdown could shatter McGill's image. In N. Sheffe (ed) Student Unrest. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1970, 16-20.

Lenin, V.I. On Politics and Revolution: Selected Writings (Ed. J.E. Connor) New York: Pegasus, 1969.

Lenin, V.I. What is to be Done? London: Panther edition, 1970.

Levich, M. The ideology of relevance. In I. Wallerstein and P. Starr (eds) The University Crisis Reader Vol. I, Vintage, 1971.

Lewis, S. and Kraut, R. Correlates of student political activism and ideology, Journal of Social Issues 28, 4, 1972, 131-149.

Libarle, M. and Seligson, T. (eds) The High School Revolutionaries, Toronto: Vintage, 1970.

Liebling, A.J. The Press (Revised) New York: Ballantine, 1964, 1972.

Lipset, S.M. American student activism. American Psychologist, 1970, 25, 8, 675-693.

Lipset, S.M. and Wolin, S.S. The Berkeley Student Revolt, Garden City, N.Y., Anchor, 1965.

Lipset, S.M. and Ladd, E. ...And what professors think. Psychology Today November, 1970, 49-51, 106.

Lothstein, A. (ed) All we are saying...The philosophy of the New Left, New York: Capricorn, 1970.

Loken, J. A multivariate analysis of student activism. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

Lumsden, I. (ed) Close the 49th Parallel etc...: the Americanization of Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Luria, A.R. The role of speech in the formation of temporary connections and the regulation of behavior in the normal and oligophrenic child. In B. Simon and S. Simon (eds) Educational Psychology in the U.S.S.R. London: Routledge, 1963, 83-97.

Macpherson, C.B. The Real World of Democracy. Toronto: CBC, 1965.

MacDonald, D. (ed) The Media Game. Montreal: Content, 1972.

MacDonald, Dwight. A theory of mass culture. In A. Casty (ed) Mass Media and Mass Man. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968, 12-24. Also in B. Rosenberg and D. White (eds) Mass Culture. New York: Free Press, 1964.

MacIntyre, A. Marcuse. London: Fontana/Collins, 1970.

Magdoff, H. The Age of Imperalism: The Economics of US Foreign Policy. New York: Monthly Review, 1969.

Mann, G. Last thoughts on 'the generation gap' Encounter XLIII, 3 (September) 1974, 62-66.

Manuel, F. Toward a psychological history of utopias. In B. McLaughlin (ed) Studies in Social Movements, Toronto, 1969, 370-399.

Marcuse, H. On Revolution. In A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn (eds) Student Power, Middlesex: Penguin, 1969.

Marcuse, H. Negations. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969b.

Marcuse, H. Re-examination of the concept of revolution. New Left Review 56, July/August, 1969c.

Marcuse, H. Socialist humanism? In E. Fromm (ed) Socialist Humanism, New York: Anchor, 1966.

Marcuse, H. One-Dimensional Man. Boston: Beacon, 1964.

Martineau, P. Motivation in Advertising. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Marx, K. From German Ideology. (Translated by T.B. Bottomore). In E. Fromm, Marx's Concept of Man. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1961, 197-216.

Marx, K. Preface to a contribution to the Karl Marx critique of political economy. In Fromm, Marx's Concept of Man. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1961, 217-219.

Marx, K. Economic and philosophical manuscripts (translated by T.B. Bottomore). In E. Fromm, Marx's Concept of Man. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1961, 90-196.

Marx, K. Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy. (Edited by T.B. Bottomore and M. Rubel) Middlesex: Penguin, 1963.

Mauss, A. On being strangled by the stars and stripes: The new left and the old left, and the natural history of American radical movements. Journal of Social Issues, 1971, 27, 1, 183-202.

McGuigan, G. (ed) Student Protest. Toronto: Metheun, 1968.

McLaughlin, B. (ed) Studies in Social Movements: A Social Psychological Perspective. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1969.

Mead, M. Youth revolt: the future is now. Saturday Review. January 10, 1970.

Meisels, M. and Canter, F. A note on the generation gap. Adolescence. Vol. 6 (Winter, 1971) 523-529.

Milgram, S. and Toch, H. Collective behavior: crowds and social movements. In Lindzey, G. and Aronson, E. (eds) The Handbook of Social Psychology, (second edition), Don Mills: Addison-Wesley, 1969, 4, 507-610.

Miller, J. McLuhan. London: Fontana/Collins, 1971.

Mills, C.W. On the new left. In P. Jacobs and S. Landau (eds) The New Radicals. New York: Vintage, 1966, pp.101-114. (Originally published as: Letter to the New Left, New Left Review September-October, 1960; also reprinted in Studies on the Left, Vol. II, I, 1961).

Mills, C.W. The Power Elite. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1956a.

Mills, C.W. White Collar. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1956b.

Moffat, G. History of the Canadian Peace Movement Until 1969. St. Catherines: Grape Vine Press, circa 1970.

Morris, C. and Small, L. Changes in conceptions of the good life by American college students from 1950 to 1970. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 20, 2.

Munns, M. The values of adolescents compared with parents and peers. Adolescence. Vol. VII, 28 (Winter) 1972, 519-523.

Musgrove, F. Youth and the Social Order. London: Routledge, 1964a.

Musgrove, F. Why youth riot: The adolescent ghetto. The Nation. 199 (1964b) 137-140.

NACLA (North American Congress on Latin America). Who Rules Columbia? P.O. Box 57, Cathedral Pk Station, N.Y., 1968.

Nairn, T. New contradictions. In A. Lothstein (ed) "All We are Saying ..." New York: Capricorn, 1970.

Neuman, F. Political power. In M. Curtis (ed), The Nature of Politics. New York: Hearst (Avon Book Div.), 1962, 163-168.

Nicholls, John G. Creativity in the person who will never produce anything original or useful: The concept of creativity as a normally distributed trait. American Psychologist. August, 1972, 717-727.

Nietzke, A. The American obsession of fun. Saturday Review. August 26, 1972, 33-35.

Nisbet, R.A. The Sociological Tradition. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Nobile, P. (ed) The Con III Controversy. Richmond Hill, Ont.: Simon and Schuster, 1971.

Novak, D.E. The tyranny of progress. New Politics, 1970, 8, 3, 39-43.

Nyquist, E. and Hawes, G. (eds) Open Education: A Sourcebook. New York: Bantam, 1972.

Oettinger, A.G. and Marks, S. Run Computer Run: The Mythology of Educational Innovation. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

Oglesby, C. The idea of the new left. In C. Oglesby (ed), The New Left Reader. New York: Grove Press, 1969, 1-20.

Ohmann, R. "To reform the academy." Saturday Review, July 17, 1971, 54-55.

Ortega, Y., Gasset, J. The Revolt of the Masses. London: Unwin, 1961.

Osgood, C. The nature and measurement of meaning. Psychological Bulletin 49, 1952, 197-237.

Perlman, F. The reproduction of everyday life. In A. Lothstein (ed) All we are Saying... New York: Capricorn, 1970.

Persons, S. The Decline of American Gentility. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.

Peterson, R.E. The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1967-1968. Princeton: E.T.S. 1968.

Petroni, F.A. Adolescent liberalism -- the myth of a generation gap. Adolescence VII, 26.

Pilleggi, N. Revolutionaries who have to be home by 7:30. Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, 51, 561-569.

Plowman, E.L. The Jesus Movement. New York: Pyramid, 1971.

Plumb, J.H. The great change in children. Horizon, winter, 1971.

Poggioli, R. The Theory of the Avante-Garde. New York: Harper and Row (Icon) 1971.

Powers, T. Diana: The Making of a Terrorist. New York: Bantam, 1971.

Price, R. The New Left in Alberta. In D. Roussopoulos (ed) The New Left in Canada. Black Rose, 1970.

Quarter, J. The Student Movement of the '60s. Toronto: OISE, 1972.

Reich, C. The Greening of America. New York: Random House, 1970.

Reid, T. and Reid, J. (eds) Student Power and the Canadian Campus. Toronto: Peter Martin, 1969.

Remmers, H.H. (ed) Anti-Democratic Attitudes in American Schools. Northwestern University Press, 1963.

Resnick, P. The political theory of extra-parliamentarism. Canadian Journal of Political Science VI, 1, 1973, 65-88.

Riesman, D. The Lonely Crowd (Revised and Abridged) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Rosenberg, B. and White, D. (eds) Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan (Free Press) 1964.

Rosenberg, B. and White, D. (eds) Mass Culture Revisited. Toronto: Van Nostrant Reinhold, 1971.

Rosenberg, B. Mass culture revisited. In B. Rosenberg and D. White (eds) Mass Culture Revisited, 1971.

Roszak, T. (ed) The Dissenting Academy. Toronto: Random House (Vintage) 1968.

Roszak, T. The Making of a Counter Culture. Garden City: Doubleday, 1969.

Roussopoulos, D. (ed) The New Left in Canada. Montreal: Black Rose, 1970.

Rudd, M. Columbia: notes on the spring rebellion. In C. Oglesby (ed), The New Left Reader, New York: Grove Press, 1969, 290-312.

Sampson, E.E. Introduction. Journal of Social Issues, 1967a, 23, 3, iii-v.

Sampson, E.E. Student activism and the decade of protest. Journal of Social Issues. 1967b, 23, 3, 1-33.

Sayre, N. Sixties Going on Seventies. New York: Curtis, 1974.

Schachter, H. Disruptions and the Gray Affair. In N. Sheffe (ed), Student Unrest. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1970, 21-35.

Schachter, S. and Singer, J. Cognitive, social and physiological determinants of emotional state. Psychological Review 69, 5, 1962, 379-399.

Schapiro, J.S. Liberalism: Its Meaning and History. Toronto: Anvil, 1958.

Schneir, W. The joy of learning in the open corridor. The New York Times Magazine, April 4, 1971, 30-31, 72-80, 92-93, 96-98.

Schrag, P. Education's romantic critics. Saturday Review, 1967, February 18.

Schrag, P. End of the impossible dream. Saturday Review, 1970, September 19.

Schweitzer, D.R. and Elden, J.M. New Left as Right: convergent themes of political discontent. Journal of Social Issues, 1971, 27, 1, 141-166.

S. D. S. Port Huron Statement. In P. Jacobs and S. Landau (eds) The New Radicals: A Report with Documents. Toronto: Random House (Vintage), 1966, 149-162.

Sedgewick, P. Varieties of socialist thought. In B. Crick and W. Robson (eds) Protest and Discontent. Middlesex: Penguin, 1970.

Seltzer, M. and Karger, H. Good morning class...my name is bzzz uzzz, crackle. Ramparts March, 1974, 10-14.

Selznick, P. Institutional vulnerability in mass society. The American Journal of Sociology 1951, LVI, 320-331. (Also in J. Gusfield (ed) Protest, Reform and Revolt, New York: Wiley, 1970, 258-274).

Sheffe, N. (ed) Student Unrest. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Shermerhorn, R.A. Society and Power. Toronto: Random House, 1961.

Skinner, B.F. Science and Human Behavior. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1953.

Skinner, B.F. Beyond Freedom and Dignity. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.

Snow, C.P. The Two Cultures: and a Second Look. Toronto: Mentor, 1963.

Staats, A. and Staats, C. Attitudes established by classical conditioning Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 1958, 57, 37-40.

Staats, C. and Staats, A. Meaning established by classical conditioning. Journal of Experimental Psychology 1957, 54, 74-80.

Steinberg, I. Educational Myths and Realities. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Stelzer, R. Keeping up with the Jones' teenagers. In Voice of America Forum Lectures. The Teenagers' World V.O.A.: (circa 1971) 68-73.

Stern, S. The Berkeley model. Canadian Dimension. September, 1966.

Stewart, J. The FLQ: Seven Years of Terror. Montreal: Simon and Shuster, Montreal Star, 1970.

Sweezy, P. and Huberman, L. The old left and the new. Monthly Review. May, 1969.

Taylor, Charles. The Pattern of Politics. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1970.

Taylor, H. The student revolution. Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1969, 62-67.

Thomas, L.E. Political generation gap: a study of liberal and conservative, activist and non-activist students and their parents. Journal of Social Psychology, 1971, 84, 313-314.

Thompson, E.P. Warwick University Ltd. Middlesex: Penguin, 1970.

Thoreson, C. and Mahoney, M. Behavioral Self-Control. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Toynbee, P. The language of inequality. In R. Blackburn and A. Cockburn (eds) The Incompatibles: Trade Union Militancy and the Consensus. Middlesex: Penguin, 1967, 95-102.

Trachtenberg, A. Culture and rebellion: Dilemmas of radical teachers. In B. Rosenberg and D.M. White(eds) Mass Culture Revisited. Toronto: Van Nostrant, 1971.

Trent, J.W. and Craise, J.L. Commitment and Conformity in the American College. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 3, 34-51.

van den Haag, E. Of happiness and despair we have no measure. In A. Casty (ed) Mass Media and Mass Man. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968, 5-11 (also in B. Rosenberg and D. White (eds) Mass Culture. New York: Free Press, 1964).

Vernon, Philip E. Creativity: A current bandwagon. The Canadian Psychologist. Vol. 14, No. 1, (January, 1973) 51-59.

Vidich, A. and Bensman, I. Small Town in Mass Society (Revised), Princeton University Press, 1968.

Wagar, W. (ed) European Intellectual History Since Darwin and Marx. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966.

Wallace, J. Behind the free university crisis. In I. Wallerstein and P. Starr (eds) The University Crisis Reader vol. II, 1971, 235-242.

Wallerstein, I. and Starr, P. (eds) The University Crisis Reader: The Liberal University Under Attack vol. I, Toronto: Vintage, 1971.

Wallerstein, I. and Starr, P. (eds) The University Crisis Reader: Confrontation and Counterattack vol. II, Toronto: Vintage, 1971.

Walters, R. and Cheyne, J. Punishment. Middlesex: Penguin, 1972.

Walters, R.H., Parke, R.D. and Crane, V. Timing of punishment and the observation of consequences to others as determinants of response inhibition. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1965, 2, 10-30.

Walters, R.H. and Parke, R.D. Social motivation, dependency and susceptibility to social influence. In L. Berkowitz (ed), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, New York: Academic Press, 1964, 1, 231-276.

Watson, J.B. and Rayner, R. Conditioned emotional reactions. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1920, 3, 1-14.

Weber, M. Charismatic Authority. In M. Curtis (ed), The Nature of Politics. New York: Hearst (Avon Book Div.), 1962, 228-232.

Whorf, B.L. In J.B. Carroll (ed), Language, Thought and Reality. New York: Wiley, 1956.

Whorf, B. The relation of habitual thought and behavior to language. In P. Adams (ed) Language and Thinking. Middlesex: Penguin, 1972, 123-149.

Williams, R. Culture and Society 1780-1950. Middlesex: Penguin, 1963.

Williams, R. (ed) May Day Manifesto, 1968. Middlesex: Penguin, 1968.

Williams, R. Communications (Revised) Middlesex: Penguin, 1968b.

Winter, G. and Nuss, E. (eds) The Young Adult, Glenview: Scott Foresman, 1969.

Wolff, R.P., Moore, B., and Marcuse, H. A Critique of Pure Tolerance. Boston: Beacon, 1969.

Wolin, S. Prometheus in America. The New York Review of Books XXI, 7 (May 2) 1974, 10-12.

Worth, W. A Choice of Futures: Report of the Commission on Educational Planning. Edmonton, Alberta: The Cabinet Committee on Education, Government of Alberta, 1972.

Yandle, S. The end of P.S.A. at Simon Fraser University. Canadian Dimension 6 (7) February-March, 1970, 16-19.

Zald, M. and Ash, R. Social movement organizations: Growth, decay and change. Social Forces XLIV, 1966, 327-341. (Also in B. McLaughlin (ed) Studies in Social Movements: A Social Psychological Perspective New York: The Free Press, 1969, pp.461-485).